

The Office of this Journal and of the WEEKLY REPORTER is now at 12, Cook's-court, Carey-street, W.C.

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s., Country 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d.; half law calf, 5s.

\* We must draw the attention of correspondents to the rule that all letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

## The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, JUNE 13, 1874.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT'S BRILLIANT SUGGESTION that the judges might be "worked in shifts like miners," so as to keep the courts open all the year round, did not meet with much favour in the House of Commons last year, and it was not very likely that the learned persons referred to would use the powers conferred on them by section 27 of the Judicature Act to carry this proposal, or anything like it, into effect. Yet a notion has been prevalent, even in the profession, that something was going to be done with the Long Vacation, and it will be with a sense of relief that many hard-worked practitioners will learn that this venerable institution is not to be disturbed. We believe that it is proposed that the legal year shall in future be divided into four sittings. The Michaelmas sitting will begin on the 2nd November, and end on the 21st December; the Hilary sitting will commence on the 11th January, and end on the Tuesday in Passion week; the Easter sitting will commence on the Tuesday after Easter week, and end upon the Thursday before Whitsuntide; and the Trinity sitting will commence on the Tuesday after Whitsuntide, and end on the 8th August. There will, therefore, be vacations at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide, and the Long Vacation will continue as heretofore.

WE PRINT in another column a petition from the Incorporated Law Society in favour of the suggestion made in this journal (*ante* p. 501) that the right of appeal to the First Division of the Imperial Court should be extended to all cases where the court of first appeal reverses, even though unanimously, the decision of the court below, and also (which we did not propose, though we heartily concur in the suggestion) to any case in which leave to appeal is specially given by either division of the appellate court. Now that it may be taken as certain, from the defeat of Lord Redesdale's proposition on Thursday last, that the new Court of Imperial Appeal will be established as proposed, the question becomes one of first importance, and we hope that none of our readers will lose any time in bringing to bear such influence as he can control to strengthen the hands of the Incorporated Law Society in the furtherance of this object.

It is, in our view, almost inconsistent to enact that a difference of opinion amongst the judges in the same court is to give a right of further appeal, and yet that a difference of opinion between the courts themselves is not to confer any such right; so that a suitor who has obtained a judgment in his favour may yet be exposed to further litigation if only one of the appellate judges differ from his brethren; and yet another may be deprived, without appeal, of the fruits of the decree which he has obtained, because the difference of judicial opinion, which exists in his case equally with the other, happens not to be expressed in precisely the same way. His case is really harder than that of the man to whom a second appeal is opened by the Bill. For it is

surely less hardship that an unsuccessful appellant should, notwithstanding that he has obtained some judicial support, be concluded by two concurring decrees, than that a respondent, who finds that which a solemn judgment has given him suddenly taken away, should be left without the means of applying to a third tribunal, to arbitrate, as it were, between the two conflicting authorities. And this reasoning will appear more cogent if we recollect that, under the Act of last year, the ordinary judges of appeal are to receive the same salary, and therefore to belong practically to the same class, as the judges of first instance.

The suggestion that a second appeal should be allowed by leave of the court to be appealed from should, we think, be guarded by providing that such leave should be applied for at the time when judgment is given dismissing the appeal, and not be made the subject of a separate subsequent application to that court, involving, perhaps, a re-hearing of the whole question.

THE PUBLIC WORSHIP REGULATION BILL has been materially altered in its passage through committee in the House of Lords; and, regarding the matter as we do from a purely legal point of view, we cannot doubt that it has been altered for the better. Instead of twenty-six courts of first instance, consisting, in each case, of the bishop of a diocese and his chancellor, we are now to have a single court, to which all ecclesiastical causes will be at once referred, presided over by a judge to be selected by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, subject to the approval of the Crown. This is a great improvement. It secures, at all events, uniformity of decision. And it also secures what the Bill in its original shape did not secure—an inexpensive and speedy process. There can be, under the Bill, as amended, but two hearings of an ecclesiastical cause; and this is of itself a great gain. But we fail to see why the new judge should not be appointed by the Crown. His position will be very different from that of a chancellor of a single diocese, and there may be some danger in leaving his nomination to the two Primates. It would be a public misfortune if a partisan judge were chosen; but if the Crown appoints there is little or no chance of such a catastrophe. If, however, the Crown appoints, the provision that the judge should be a "member of the Church of England" becomes absurd and ought to be expunged. For legal purposes no inquiry whatever into creed should be made. As a rule, of course, a churchman would be selected, but it is a retrograde step to impose by statute any religious test upon any judicial officer. Disputes about the religious tenets of Nonconformists are frequently settled satisfactorily and impartially by Vice-Chancellors who do not belong to any Nonconformist community; and disputes about the construction of the rubrics, which after all are only disputes about the construction of the Act of Uniformity, may be safely left to the decision of any lawyer whom the Crown may choose, whatever the creed of the lawyer chosen may happen to be.

TWO QUESTIONS of considerable importance were decided last week in the Court of Exchequer, relating to the individual responsibility for torts of members of highway boards, and of surveyors acting under their orders. It appears that in November, 1872, the highway board for the district in which the village of Boscastle, in Cornwall, is situated, took upon themselves to direct their surveyor to remove an obstruction placed across a path alleged by them to be a public path, by the tenant of the land through which it ran. He brought an action of trespass against the members of the board individually, and against the surveyor who, under the orders of the board, had removed the obstruction. The cause was tried before the Lord Chief Baron, at Bodmin, last August, when the plaintiff was non-suited, on the ground that the defendant members of the board were not personally liable, and that the surveyor was shielded from

liability by the circumstance that he acted under the orders of the highway board. Upon both points the Court of Exchequer has set aside the nonsuit, the Lord Chief Baron, however, dissenting from the judgment of the majority of the court. Notice of appeal against this decision has been given, and we do not desire to anticipate its final result, but its importance both to the members of highway boards, and to the ratepayers of highway districts, can scarcely be exaggerated. If it should turn out, as the plaintiff contends, and as the Court of Exchequer have decided, that the highway board have no authority whatever as a corporation to direct an obstruction in an alleged highway to be removed, it would seem that the defendants must justify their act not as a corporation, but as members of the public. In that case the nonsuit would appear to be wrong, for no evidence was offered at the trial that the *locus in quo* was a highway. The trespass was proved, and there the matter ended, the defendants relying upon the legal point raised. It seems, no doubt, at first sight, to be somewhat harsh to hold that the individual corporators are personally liable for an act done in the *bona fide* exercise of what they erroneously but honestly believe to be their corporate powers. But, on the other hand, if they have, although not intentionally, exceeded these powers, it is hard that the ratepayers should have to pay for the blunder. It is more in accordance both with principle and authority to hold, with the Court of Exchequer, that the individuals must pay for it themselves. That the corporation is not liable as such for an act done beyond the scope of its purpose and authority is abundantly clear, and the defendants, in order to succeed, were bound to make out that they had authority under their Acts of Parliament to give the order complained of. Whether they will succeed ultimately, depends upon the construction to be placed on numerous sections of the Highway Acts, to which we do not propose at present to refer in detail. We have said enough to indicate to our readers the importance of the question which has just been decided by the court of first instance.

With regard to the surveyor, the nonsuit proceeded upon different considerations. He was the servant of the board, and committed the trespass complained of by their orders. But still his was the hand which committed the tort, and the Court of Exchequer have failed to see any ground upon which he is to be held to be exempt from liability. The Chief Baron ruled that he was not liable, because he was simply doing as he was told, and that the maxim "*respondet superior*" applied not only to charge his employers, but to relieve him. Upon this point, too, there may perhaps be room for doubt; but whilst the case is still pending in the Court of Appeal we forbear from pronouncing a positive opinion upon it.

ONE OF THE LITTLE SCHEMES, savouring of meanness and injustice, by which the Treasury seek to relieve this overburdened and groaning nation has just been signally defeated. In August last year when Sir George Jessel was appointed Master of the Rolls, it became a question which of the officers of the late Master of the Rolls were personal officers, and retired with Lord Romilly. Sir George Jessel, while contending that the secretary was such an officer, expressed his intention of continuing, and did continue, in office the gentleman who had served under his predecessor. It was forthwith contended on behalf of the Treasury that this was a new appointment, and that they had consequently the power to attach to the office such a salary as they might think fit. Not unnaturally, objections were raised to this view by Sir George Jessel and the holder of the office; especially when—the original salary being £1,000 per annum—the Treasury calmly named £500 as the future salary. The matter has been contested with that department for the last ten months, but we are glad to learn that at length the Treasury have had to give way, and that the secretary to the Master of

the Rolls who, we believe, has not during that period received any part of his official income, is to have all arrears made up to him immediately.

IN THE INTERESTING DISCUSSION which took place last week on the Public Worship Regulation Bill, the Lord Chancellor alluded to the alleged conflict of decisions in *Martin v. Mackonochie* (17 W. R. 187) and *Hebbert v. Purchas* (19 W. R. 898), as to the attitude of the officiating minister at the time of consecration in the communion service. It may be worth while to point out that *Martin v. Mackonochie* decided that the posture of the minister should be "standing" and not "kneeling"; *Hebbert v. Purchas* decided that his position should be at the north end of the holy table. There is some difficulty in reconciling the *dicta* in the two cases, but the decisions may well stand together. We may add that the latter case has never been regarded as satisfactory, and there is much to be said in favour of a compromise on this point. It is confessedly one of extreme obscurity, and might well be left for settlement to the minister and the majority of his congregation.

LORD WESTBURY, in the course of his judgment in *Mayor of London v. Cox* (16 W. R. at p. 57, L. R. 2 H. L. at p. 295), expressed with fervour his happiness "that that judgment would have the effect of reducing the jurisdiction of the Mayor's Court within its proper and just bounds." Neither that judgment, however, nor the practice of granting rules for a prohibition with costs when there has been a clear excess of jurisdiction, has proved sufficient to check the misuse of the jurisdiction of the court. Applications for prohibitions have become so frequent that in a recent case *Brett, J.*, expressed the determination of the Court of Common Pleas to "stamp out" the practice of improperly invoking the Mayor's Court, and on Thursday last Lord Coleridge announced that "if the attorneys were made parties to the rules, if made absolute they would be so made with costs against them. If the Bar showed any reluctance so to move," continued his Lordship, "the court would try to manage to make the attorneys pay costs notwithstanding." We wait with some curiosity to see how the court will carry out this last threat.

#### EXONERATION FROM PERFORMANCE OF A CONTRACT BY DEFAULT OF THE OTHER CONTRACTING PARTY.

We have on several occasions referred to the question how far the default of one party to a contract relieves the other party from performance,\* and the cognate question of how far a party to a contract is released by circumstances making a complete fulfilment according to the intention of the parties impossible.† The former class of cases has been recently illustrated by the decision of the Court of Common Pleas in *Freeth v. Burr* (22 W. R. 370). In none of the cases of this class referred to above, except *Ex parte Chalmers, Re Edwards* (21 W. R. 349, L. R. 8 Ch. 289), did the question turn upon default in making payment for goods actually delivered; and in that case the question was complicated by the circumstance that insolvency had supervened. It was there held that the trustee in bankruptcy of the buyer, who had failed to pay for the last instalment, was not entitled to require any further delivery without paying the existing debt, as well as being ready to pay cash for any further delivery which he required. And not only the facts but both the reasoning and the expressions of the judgment limit the decision to the case of insolvency. In the earlier case indeed of *Withers v. Reynolds* (2 B. & Ad. 882), so often cited on both sides of this question, and so often explained away, the actual

\* See 16 S. J. 731, 17 S. J. 219, 303.  
† 16 S. J. 422, 18 S. J. 220.

default which was held to discharge the seller from further delivery was merely a default in payment on delivery for one load, when, according to the contract, the buyer was bound to pay for each load on delivery. That refusal, however, was made in a form which imported that the buyer would not pay for any of the loads to be afterwards delivered according to the contract, and three of the judges who decided the case (Lord Tenterden, C.J., Parke, J., and Patteson, J.) clearly took it in that sense. Now in the case of *Freeth v. Burr* there was nothing of this import; but the buyer had claimed to deduct a sum in respect of damages for delay from the price to be paid for the first instalment of goods actually delivered; and had refused to pay without making this deduction; thereupon the seller had refused to proceed with the delivery of the second instalment, and for this alleged breach the action was brought. Certainly there was no case which at all came up to this contention on the part of the seller. As a rule, the mere payment of money has not been considered to be so much of the essence of the contract that failure to pay at the right time has, except in the case of insolvency, or where it is expressly so provided, dispensed the other side from performance. The failure to pay at the stipulated time (in contradistinction to the general inability to pay which is involved in insolvency) does not, like the failure in some other stipulations, involve a total failure of consideration, or an alteration in the substance of the consideration, or a frustration of the object of the contract. No doubt one who sells contemplates having his money according to his contract; but, regarding money as a commodity always obtainable at its proper price, which is the view the law uniformly takes, and treating the delay of payment as a thing which can be wholly compensated for by damages in the shape of interest, mere delay of payment cannot be looked upon as affecting fatally the character or object of the contract. Yet *Withers v. Reynolds* seems an authority for saying that where there is not a mere failure to pay according to contract, but something amounting to a refusal beforehand to pay according to contract for subsequent deliveries, that refusal in effect amounts to such a repudiation of his obligation on the part of the buyer as precludes him from enforcing those subsequent deliveries. But the interpretation put upon that case by Lord Coleridge, C.J., and assented to by Keating and Denman, JJ., in the case of *Freeth v. Burr*, and which is also applied, by the Chief Justice at least, to *Hoare v. Rennie* (8 W. R. 80, 5 H. & N. 14), is that "the true question is whether, when one party claims to be set free by the action of another party, the action of that other party amounts to an affirmative assertion of his abandonment. Non-payment on the one side, or non-delivery on the other, may amount to such an act or assertion, or, at all events, it may afford sufficient evidence of such an intention to go to a jury—that is to say, it may justify a judge in holding, or a jury in finding, that such an act amounts to an indication on the part of the assessor of his intention to abandon the contract, and so to set free the other party."

Now what, in effect, does this amount to? It cannot mean that there must exist in fact an intention on the part of the defaulting party to abandon his rights under the contract; on the contrary, he claims to have the other party perform his part of the contract for the benefit of him, the defaulting party. The "abandonment," therefore, is not that sort of express repudiation which, in many cases (of which *Frost v. Knight*, 20 W. R. 471, L. R. 7 Ex. 111, is one of the most recent and best known), has been held to entitle the other side to sue as upon a broken contract, without waiting for the time when performance should be due, and which amounts to an assertion by the defaulting party that he will have nothing more to do with the contract. It is something, indeed, which cannot be properly described as an abandonment of the contract at all, for a man may abandon what is in his own power, and two con-

tracting parties may mutually abandon and rescind the contract between them, but one contracting party cannot properly be said to abandon a contract by which he is bound; but it is something which, if properly described as an abandonment, is the abandonment by one party of his rights under the contract, not expressly, but by an implication contradicting his express intention—an abandonment which is implied from the inconsistency of his acts or his declared intention as regards his own obligation, with the performance of the contract according to its terms. Does this theory really get us any farther forward? It comes to no more than this—that a party may so repudiate his obligations under the contract as to abandon his rights, contrary to his meaning and intention, by inference of law; but nothing is gained by using the word "abandonment," which expresses a voluntary renunciation; whereas the loss of the right to enforce the contract is not the result of any such voluntary renunciation on the part of the defaulter, but follows from the repudiation by him of his obligations under the contract. What, therefore, is pointed at as amounting to a release of the other side, though the language chosen is unfortunate, seems to be the repudiation on the part of a contracting party of his obligations under the contract. But then the question arises, what will amount to such a repudiation? If *Withers v. Reynolds* is good law (and it has been always so treated), if the one party says, in effect, "I call upon you to perform your part of the contract, but I give you notice that I shall not perform my corresponding obligation," that amounts to such a repudiation of his own part as will entitle the other side to refuse to go on performing his part under those conditions. Perhaps, also, if the breach of his obligation by one party is so considerable and systematic as to justify the conclusion that he has no real intention of performing his obligations, that will amount to such a repudiation. But in the absence of such express repudiation, or acts justifying such a conclusion, the breach or non-performance by one party affords no ground to the other party for refusing to fulfil the obligations on his side. In short, though mere non-performance is not repudiation, yet it may be evidence of repudiation. So understood, the case of *Freeth v. Burr* would lay down an intelligible rule, and one more thoroughly logical and consistent than has been yet propounded; it must, at the same time, be allowed that it will not suffice to reconcile all the cases; but since the cases are at present admitted to be irreconcilable this cannot be regarded as forming any objection to it. It may be added that it seems a corollary from this proposition that if such a repudiation is established as will free the other side from continuing to perform, that repudiation would, at the same time, on the principle of *Frost v. Knight* and similar cases, give the other side a right of action for breach of the contract.

It remains to be observed that this class of cases cannot be considered as affecting the well-settled rule established by *Freeman v. Taylor* (8 Bing. 124), and carried to a still greater length in *Jackson v. Union Marine Insurance Company* (22 W. R. 79, L. R. 8 C. P. 572). The class of cases commented on above refers to the sale of goods, as to which it is supposed (as a rule, correctly) that the deficiency can be supplied by the market, and rights adjusted by reference to its prices. The case is materially different where the contract refers to a specific chattel like a ship, and a definite and complex adventure like a voyage.

#### RESTRAINT ON ANTICIPATION.

In the case of *In re Ellis' Trusts* (22 W. R. 448, L. R. 17 Eq. 409) an attempt was made to draw a distinction between instances in which the corpus of property is given or settled to the separate use of a married woman, with a restraint on "anticipation," and those instances in which the corpus so given or settled is made



subject to a restraint on "alienation." The reported case which prompted the taking of the distinction was *Re Sykes' Trusts* (2 J. & H. 415, 11 W. R. Ch. Dig. 37), where a married woman, being entitled for her separate use to a sum of stock subject to a life estate therein, induced a person, while her interest was still reversionary, to advance money to her husband on her written promise that the loan should be repaid out of the fund when it fell into possession, and, after an order had been made by the court upon the death of the tenant for life, for the transfer of the whole fund to the married woman, Wood, V.C., held that at the time when the letters were written she had no power to bind herself, "she being subject to a restraint on anticipation." If the restraint in that case had in so many words been on "anticipation," the decision would have afforded some ground for the distinction taken in the recent case. But, as a matter of fact, the restraint was on alienation, being against making any "sale, mortgage, charge, or incumbrance" on the fund. Counsel in *Re Ellis' Trusts* was accordingly driven to argue that in the cited case the restraint was treated as being against anticipation. And indeed this seems to have been so. Through the use of the familiar expression "restraint on anticipation," both counsel and judge appear to have been led to neglect the real terms of the restraint; and, so far as the report shows, the effect of a restraint on "alienation" upon a gift of stock to a married woman for her separate use was not considered. Looking, however, at the actual decision in the case, *Re Sykes' Trusts* was an authority for the proposition that where there is an immediate gift of stock to a married woman for her separate use with a restraint on alienation, the restraint is wholly inoperative.

This case, however, was soon afterwards followed by two cases, both decided by Wood, V.C., in which full effect was given to a restraint on alienation where the corpus of the gift vested in possession (*Re Sarel*, 10 Jur. N. S. 876; *Re Gaskell's Trusts*, 11 Jur. N. S. 780). In both these cases the gift was of money or proceeds of sale, and although there were expressions in the wills creating the gifts which might be construed as contemplating the payment of the corpus to the married women, yet the sums having been paid into court by the executors, the Vice-Chancellor held that they must not be paid out to the married women, but must be retained in court during the respective covertures of the legatees. It may therefore be taken as settled that where the gift is to a married woman for her separate use with a restraint on alienation, the fund, whether it produces income or not, cannot be handed over to her, but must be invested or paid into court, and the interest or dividends only paid to the legatee as they from time to time become payable.

Is there any difference where the restraint purports to be on anticipation, and makes no express reference to alienation? The recent case of *Re Ellis' Trusts* is an authority for the proposition that where, as in the case of Consols, the gift is of a perpetual annuity, the restraint on anticipation prevents alienation; and the judge went out of his way to base the decision on the broader principle that where a fund producing income is given with a restraint on anticipation, there can be no alienation; and he cited in support of his view the remarks of the judges who decided *Baggett v. Meux* (1 Coll. 138, 1 Ph. 627). *Baggett v. Meux*, we may observe, was a case where the restraint was on alienation, and though the Master of the Rolls cited it for the purpose of showing that in the opinion of the judges who decided it there was no distinction between real and personal estate or between corpus and income, yet, strictly speaking, no inference can be drawn from it except that a restraint on alienation is good as to all kinds of property, a point now, as we have seen, covered by decision.

Our remarks on the recent case would not be complete if we did not refer to the new element which the Master of the Rolls has introduced into the consideration

of this subject. In his opinion it is material to consider whether the fund given is or is not producing income. According to his view, if it is producing income, "anticipation" is equivalent to "alienation," and if it is not, other considerations must be taken into account. The question whether, having regard to all the authorities and the general meaning hitherto attached to the expression "restraint on anticipation," "anticipation" must not be taken as a term of art and as equivalent to "alienation," remains apparently yet to be decided. Two cases may be suggested as likely to raise the point: (1) a gift of cash to a married woman with a restraint on anticipation; and (2) a gift, with a similar restraint, of cash after a life estate, as, for example, the proceeds of sale of a testator's estate directed to be converted upon the death of his widow. In the first instance the word anticipation must either be disregarded altogether or read as equivalent to alienation. In the second instance it might be contended that anticipation meant only realisation before the fund came into possession. The question will not be certain until this second instance shall have arisen and been decided.

## RECENT DECISIONS.

### EQUITY.

#### INJUNCTION TO RESTRAIN TRESPASS.

*Stanford v. Hurlstone*, L.C. & L.J.J., 22 W. R. 422, L. R. 9 Ch. 116.

A broad distinction was formerly drawn by the Court of Chancery between "waste"—i.e., acts of spoliation committed and suffered respectively by persons between whom privity of title existed, and "trespass"—i.e., acts of spoliation committed and suffered respectively by persons claiming by adverse titles, as to which, in many of the earlier cases, it seems to have been thought that the court should refuse to interfere. In *Lovendes v. Bettie* (12 W. R. 399, 10 Jur. 226) Kindersley, V.C., elaborately reviewed the cases relating to the latter acts, and came to the conclusion that the tendency of the more recent decisions has been to break down this distinction. As the result of this process he laid down the following as the modern rules on the subject:—Where a defendant is in possession, and a plaintiff claiming possession seeks to restrain him from committing acts of spoliation, the court will not interfere, unless the acts are so flagrant as to justify the court in departing from the general principle. Where the plaintiff is in possession, and the person doing the acts complained of is an utter stranger, not claiming under the colour of right, the tendency of the court is not to grant the injunction. But where the person in possession seeks to restrain one who claims by adverse title, the tendency is to grant the injunction, at least where the acts done might tend to the destruction of the estate. The facts in *Stanford v. Hurlstone* were held to bring the case under this last head, and the Court of Appeal had no hesitation in confirming the order of the Master of the Rolls, granting an injunction to restrain the acts of spoliation threatened by the defendant.

We refer to the case in order to point out that sub-section 8 of section 25 of the Judicature Act seems to be intended to sweep away the distinctions alluded to above. That sub-section provides that "if an injunction is asked . . . to prevent any threatened or apprehended waste or trespass, such injunction may be granted, if the court shall think fit, whether the person, against whom such injunction is sought, is or is not in possession under any claim of title or otherwise; or (if out of possession) does or does not claim a right to do the act sought to be restrained under any colour of title; and whether the estates claimed by both or by either of the parties are legal or equitable."



## NOTES.

## HOME.

A somewhat curious question, as to the right of proof under section 31 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, came before the Chief Judge on Monday in a case of *Ex parte Naden*. A bankrupt named Wood had married his deceased wife's sister. In the year 1858 he separated from her, and a separation deed in the ordinary form was executed, in which she was described as his wife, and he covenanted with trustees to pay her an annuity of £40 during the joint lives of himself and her, and the trustees covenanted to indemnify him against her debts. There was a proviso that, in case Wood and the lady should, by mutual consent, live together again, the deed should be void. The annuity was paid for twelve years, and then Wood was adjudicated a bankrupt. The judge of the Kingston County Court decided that the value of the future payments of the annuity was, within the words of section 31, "incapable of being fairly estimated," and was, therefore, not proveable in the bankruptcy. The Chief Judge was of opinion that since the parties never could legally live together again as husband and wife, as was contemplated by the proviso making void the deed, the deed must be read as if that proviso was not in it, and that the annuity must be taken to be one payable during the joint lives of Wood and the lady. Such an annuity could be valued, and the value was, therefore, proveable in the bankruptcy.

In another case of *Ex parte Tinker* the creditors of a liquidating debtor had passed a resolution authorising the trustee to accept an offer which had been made to purchase the whole of the debtor's estate and effects for £6,000, payable in three instalments. A deed was executed by which the trustee assigned to the purchaser all the property which had passed to him under the proceedings, or which he had in any way power to dispose of. The instalments having been duly paid, the debtor applied to the trustee to summon a meeting of the creditors to consider the propriety of granting him an order of discharge. The meeting was held, but no order of discharge was granted. The purchaser of the debtor's property had taken him into partnership, and the creditors claimed the profits made by the debtor. An order was made by the registrar of the Huddersfield County Court restraining the creditors from seizing or interfering with the profits of the business, or taking any proceedings against the debtor or his property in respect of their debts. The Chief Judge affirmed this order, on the ground that the creditors having sold the whole estate it would be inequitable for them to take proceedings against the debtor's property because no formal order of discharge had been granted to him. It will be remembered that by section 125, sub-section 9, of the Act the debtor's discharge is in the case of a liquidation to be granted by a special resolution of the creditors. The result of this decision was practically to give the debtor what was equivalent to discharge, though no special resolution of the creditors granting him his discharge had been passed.

## FOREIGN.

## FRANCE.

A rather singular case came before the ninth chamber of the *Tribunal Correctionnel* of Paris on the 3rd ult. In December last the *Batonnier* of the *Ordre des avocats* was informed that many persons in advocates' robes appeared and defended prisoners before the courts martial at Versailles who were not really members of the bar. A man of the name of Chanloup was particularly mentioned as having done this in many cases. He had rather imprudently distinguished himself by the vehemence of his invectives against the military and the Government. These intemperate outbursts, "which," says the reporter in the *Gazette des Tribunaux*, "one certainly never meets with among those who have the honour to wear the advocate's gown," excited the suspicion of the authorities, and it was discovered that Chanloup was not a member of the bar. He was now charged with having illegally worn the costume of an *avocat*. It appeared from the evidence of a witness who had been tried by one of the courts martial, that Chanloup had received 100 francs for defending him, and Chanloup confessed to having

defended many other prisoners at Versailles, but he alleged that he did not at first wear the advocates' gown. The Court sentenced Chanloup, under article 259 of the *Code Penal*, to two months' imprisonment.

The First Chamber of the Court of Appeal at Paris was occupied last Monday but one with one of the many suits which have arisen out of the German invasion. The commune of Saint Cyr was, during that invasion, subjected by the enemy to numerous requisitions. The communal authorities, acting in the general interest of the inhabitants, agreed with various contractors to furnish the supplies required. One of these contractors was M. Gaillard, a timber merchant, who had supplied wood to the value of 12,000 francs. After the close of the war the Commune demanded payment from the owners of property within its bounds of the sums paid to these contractors. Among these owners of property was the Government, as the proprietor of the celebrated military school of Saint Cyr, and the Commune sued the Minister at War, as representing the Government, before the Tribunal Civil at Versailles for the proportion of M. Gaillard's bill which, as was alleged, belonged to the college. It was contended on behalf of the Commune that the supplies were furnished on behalf and in the interest of the college. The Tribunal, however, dismissed the suit, on the ground that it had no jurisdiction to entertain the question, the cognisance of matters of this kind being, by art. 14 of the Decree of 4th June, 1806, committed to the *Conseil d'Etat*. The Commune appealed from this decision; but the Court of Appeal confirmed the order of the court below, and dismissed the appeal with costs.

## GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

## THE LAND TRANSFER BILL—COMPULSORY REGISTRATION.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—It appears to me that far more importance has been attached to the clause in this Act rendering registration compulsory than it deserves. The only penalty for non-registration is that a conveyance by a vendor to a purchaser will not pass the legal estate. It will, however, take full effect in equity, and upon completion of the purchase and payment of the purchase-money, the vendor will become a trustee of the legal estate for the purchaser, who may immediately compel a conveyance of such estate to himself. The purchase will have to be actually completed; but this done, the legal estate may, if it shall be deemed important, be got in at the very trifling expense of a deed endorsed on the purchase-deed.

The real compulsion, however, will be found in another clause originally contained in this Bill, but now transferred to one of the Bills associated with it. I mean the clause taking away the protection afforded by the legal estate. At present great reliance is placed upon this protection. Upon the completion of a purchase, inquiry is made for equitable charges, &c., and if none are disclosed, the purchaser completes his purchase with confidence and a feeling of security, knowing that if a prior incumbrance should be afterwards sprung upon him he will still be safe, as being a purchaser without notice and with the legal estate. Take away this protection, and the security of unregistered titles will be greatly shaken. A purchaser will, at any time, be liable to have his title challenged by some person claiming a prior equity, and will no longer be able to set up the legal estate in answer to it. All feeling of comfort and security will be taken away, and nothing but a registered title will, in fact, be safe. This it seems to me is the real compulsion; but whether the protection of the legal estate ought to be taken away, at least until registration has been proved by experience to be a practicable thing, is, I think, more than doubtful.

## A CONVEYANCER.

[With reference to the first part of this letter, we venture, with deference, to doubt whether our correspondent has sufficiently weighed the words of clause 27—"any deed or instrument of conveyance of the land shall operate in equity only, and not be effectual at law to pass the legal estate in the land." We should be inclined to read this as meaning not merely that the first deed of conveyance of the

land shall operate in equity, but that every deed of conveyance of the land before registration of some person as proprietor, shall operate in equity only. If this reading be correct, the undorsed deed, purporting to convey the legal estate, would be a nullity.—Ed. & J.]

## COURTS.

### QUEEN'S BENCH.

(Before MELLOR, LUSH, QUAIN, and ARCHIBALD, JJ.)

June 10.—*In re Thomas Boon Clements.*

Sir Henry James applied on behalf of Mr. Clements for a rule nisi, directing the examiners to examine Mr. Clements, a candidate for admission as an attorney. Mr. Clements was articled to an attorney at Bristol. He passed his intermediate examination in 1870, and should have undergone his final examination in 1872; but on that occasion he was personated by Mr. Ayre, an attorney of Bristol, who had since been struck off the rolls for the personation (16 S. J. 633). In June, 1873, Mr. Clements applied for a rule directing him to be examined, but the court refused the application (17 S. J. 651). He had since been employed as managing clerk to Mr. Williams, of Bristol, and he had filed eleven affidavits in his favour from solicitors and inhabitants of that city. The applicant could not now be examined before Michaelmas Term, by which time he would have suffered suspension for two years and six months.

Garth, Q.C., and Murray, for the Incorporated Law Society, said the affidavits of Mr. Clements' conduct during the past year were very satisfactory, and the only question was whether sufficient time had elapsed.

The Court said the application was premature, considering the very serious nature of the offence committed by Mr. Clements, and they declined to specify any time at which the application might be renewed.

## APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. MICHAEL GLOVER ATKINS, solicitor, of Tamworth, has been appointed a Commissioner to take affidavits within the counties of Stafford, Warwick, Derby, Leicester, and Nottingham.

## PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATION.

### HOUSE OF LORDS.

June 5.—*Customs and Inland Revenue Bill.*—This Bill was read a third time and passed.

*Judicature Act Amendment Bill.*—On the motion for the second reading of this Bill, Lord PENZANCE said the Bill contained an amendment of extreme importance—namely, the restoring of the second appeal in all cases, whether of common law or coming from Chancery. With it arose the question of what the ultimate Court of Appeal should be. This question had never been decided. If there was to be but one appeal it was absolutely impossible that appeal could be to their Lordships' House. Consequently, when last year it was decided there should be only one appeal, it was further decided that such appeal should not be to their Lordships' House. The reason which justified the abolition of the jurisdiction of their Lordships' House would cease to operate when Parliament erased from the Act of last year the clause doing away with a second appeal. Looking at the matter in the interest of the suitors, he did not believe it would be possible to construct a Court of Ultimate Appeal in which the country would have the same confidence as it had in their Lordships' House. He could not say the court proposed by the Bill would be an improvement. The new court was to be a section carved as it were out of the Court of Appeal established last year. If you were to carve one court out of another the question arose why did not you make a separate court? It was not desired that one court should be considered paramount and the other subordinate; but it was impossible to avoid the result that the one court which overruled the other would be considered the superior

court. The provision that the judges were to be removed periodically from one court to the other was one which could hardly be expected to work satisfactorily.—Lord SELBORNE said it was quite consistent with the principle of a single appeal that a court whose decisions were to be final should have the power of reviewing and reconsidering its own decisions. It was not proposed now any more than last year—he was speaking now of England, not of Ireland and Scotland—that there should be an intermediate Court of Appeal and a Court of Final Appeal. What was proposed was that in any case which had been heard before the Court of Final Appeal there should be a power of rehearing by a greater number of judges, so as to insure the most careful deliberation and the best-considered decision which, under the circumstances, was possible. As far as English appeals were concerned, and the principle went, there was no difference whatever between the proposal of the Bill of last year and the Bill of this. But as to the machinery by which it was to be done there was a difference. Last year it was proposed that the Court of Final Appeal should give a rehearing by virtue of its own inherent power. But now his noble and learned friend, having to provide for Irish and Scotch appeals, had thought it better to regulate the mode in which it should be done. That mode would no doubt require careful consideration, but it was in substance the same power as was given to the court by the Bill of last year. Of this he was convinced that there existed no practical or solid reasons for believing that the judicial power of the new court would be inferior to that of the House of Lords, or that the confidence of the public in it would be less.—LORD HATHERLEY said the jurisdiction of their Lordships' House since a reality ever since O'Connell's case, their Lordships having relegated the decision of appeals to a small committee, which took the duty on itself. Then there was some doubt whether an adequate number of Peers could always be secured. Some of their Lordships must remember, as he was old enough to do, when the Lord Chancellor sat to consider appeals from his own decisions, with the assistance of two Lords called in as assessors, who did nothing. And evidence had been given before the committee of their Lordships' House which sat on the subject, of a Lord Chancellor coming to a conflicting decision with himself. Accident at times would deprive the tribunal, after the case had been heard for the most part, of the attendance of the noble and learned Lords who had heard it. Again, the vacations of Parliament being frequent and protracted caused great inconvenience to suitors. These among other reasons induced their Lordships to abandon, after grave consideration, their appellate jurisdiction, and he sincerely trusted they would not reverse the decision they had arrived at.—LORD O'HAGAN pointed out that when their Lordships consented to give up their appellate jurisdiction the opinion of Ireland and Scotland on the subject had not been considered.—LORD MONCRIEFF said that in consequence of the expression of opinion by the legal profession in Scotland in favour of retaining the appellate jurisdiction of that House he would feel it his duty to support the amendment of which notice had been given by the noble Lord.—THE LORD CHANCELLOR declined to enter upon the general question of the appellate jurisdiction of the House. He knew and had felt as much as any person that when the jurisdiction of the House in the administration of the law is terminated it will lose the benefit of much traditional dignity and prestige which it has enjoyed. He had never disguised that fact; it would be vain to seek to disguise it; and a sense of it had led him to struggle to find out a way in which to maintain the jurisdiction. He felt certain that, if the present measure passed, and if the appointments under it are made in a fitting manner, it cannot but happen that the Court of Appeal will, as regards the men and the elements composing it, be the strongest legal court that this country could possibly produce. He did not agree that the object and effect of this Bill is to reverse or repeal the Bill of last year as to appeals. He understood one of the principles of the Bill of last year to be that, under certain circumstances, and with certain qualifications, there might, after a hearing before one of the divisions of the Court of Appeal, be a rehearing before a greater number of judges. Of course the meaning of such a procedure, after it has been developed by rules, is, not that there will be a judgment, and afterwards a reversal of the judgment, but that before judgment is finally given, and although a decision has been arrived at and expressed, the decision will be subject to review, and the final judgment will be pronounced after such review. The objection which

he felt was that the power of having this rehearing was not conferred as a matter of right, but was made optional on the part of the tribunal which in the first instance heard the case as to the terms and occasions on which a rehearing should be allowed. That was a matter of detail. He proposed that it be allowed when there is a difference of opinion at the first hearing. Their Lordships might think proper, however, to give a still greater licence in the matter.—Lord REDESDALE said that nobody had asked for the removal of the appeals from that House. Never had there been a legislative change made with so little occasion for it. With regard to the proposed new Court of Appeal, one great objection he had to it was that the judges would be appointed for only a limited time—namely, for three years. At the end of that period they might or might not be re-appointed. This he regarded as a most unconstitutional proposal, for it would make the appointments depend practically upon a continuance of the favour of the Crown. Then it appeared that there would be a different tribunal for Scotland and Ireland and for England. In the latter case there would be a rehearing, while Scotland and Ireland only were to have appeals, and were, therefore, as it seemed to him, placed in an inferior position. He meant to press the resolution of which he had given notice to a division on the motion for going into committee. The Bill was read a second time.

June 8.—*Public Worship Regulation Bill*.—The House having again gone into Committee on this Bill, and the consideration of clause 8 having been resumed, after many amendments had been negatived, the LORD CHANCELLOR suggested the introduction of the words "within the last twelve months," which were adopted.

On the motion of Earl BEAUCHAMP an amendment was introduced, the object of which was to insure obedience, not only on the part of the incumbent, but of any person officiating for him.

The Marquis of BATH moved to insert in page 3, line 22, after "prayer," "so far as such directions have not been modified by lawful authority." The amendment was agreed to, as was also a verbal amendment by the same noble lord in line 25.

The LORD CHANCELLOR moved an amendment to the effect that no proceedings should be taken under the Act in respect of any alteration made in the fabric, or any addition made to it, more than five years before the passing of the measure. This was agreed to. On the motion that the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill, Lord SELBORNE moved in page 3 to leave out clause 8 and insert:—"It shall be lawful for the bishop of any diocese, if he shall think fit, and whether he shall or shall not have been previously resorted to by any person for his advice or direction concerning any of the matters in question, at any time to issue a monition in writing, under his hand, to any incumbent within his diocese, giving such directions as to such bishop may seem proper to insure the due observance of the order of the Church of England, as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer, or to prohibit the use in the ministrations of such incumbent, or in any church or burial-ground within his parish, of any rites, ceremonies, forms, or observances, or of any ornaments of the church, or of any of the ministers thereof, which in the judgment of such bishop are contrary to law. Such monition may be in the form contained in schedule (B) to this Act, or in any form similar in effect thereto; and any such monition may be from time to time, or at any time, revoked by such bishop or his successors." After much discussion clause 8 was agreed to without a division.

On clause 9, which relates to the consideration of the representation by the bishop, the Marquis of SALISBURY moved to omit the words from "same" down to "the prescribed mode," the object being to bring the matter at once before the judge. On a division the amendment was negatived by 93 to 49.

Earl NELSON proposed an amendment in sub-section B, to the effect that security should be given for costs before the appeal. On a division the amendment was carried by 71 to 58.

Sub-sections C, D, and E were ordered to stand part of the clause.

Sub-sections F, G, and H of the new clause—which provide for a special case to be heard and reported on by the judge, the bishop's judgment and monition, and a final

appeal—were agreed to, and the clause was added to the Bill.

Clauses 9, 10, 11, and 12 were struck out of the Bill; clause 13 (fees of the registrar) was agreed to, and clauses 14, 15, and 16 were struck out.

A new clause by the Earl of SHAPPEESBURY, providing that the special case settled by the judge shall form the basis of the appeal, and no fresh evidence be admitted without permission was agreed to.

June 9.—*India Councils Bill*.—This Bill passed through committee.

*Public Worship Regulation Bill*.—The House went into committee on this Bill.

Clause 17 (monition to be in force pending an appeal, unless the bishop or Court of Appeal otherwise direct) was withdrawn.

Clauses 18 and 19 were agreed to.

Clause 20 (cathedrals) was struck out.

On clause 21, which provides that if the bishop shall direct in any monition that a faculty shall be applied for, such fees only shall be paid for it as may be directed by the rules and orders, the Marquis of SALISBURY moved an amendment that as provision was made in the Bill for enforcing the taking out of a faculty for the ornaments and furniture of a church, such faculty should be granted gratuitously. The amendment was agreed to, and the clause, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 22 was agreed to.—The Archbishop of York moved, after clause 22, to insert as a new clause:—"If any bishop shall be unable from illness to discharge any of the duties imposed upon him by this Act in regard to any representation, the archbishop of the province shall act in the place of such bishop in all matters thereafter arising in relation to such representation, and if any archbishop shall be unable from illness to discharge any of the duties imposed upon him by this Act in regard to any representation, her Majesty may, by her sign manual, appoint an archbishop or bishop to act in the place of such archbishop in all matters thereafter arising in relation to such representation." The clause was agreed to.

Progress was then reported.

*Infants' Contracts Bill*.—Viscount MIDLETON, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said the first clause provided that contracts by infants, except for necessities, should be void; the second, that no action should be brought on ratification of an infant's contract; and the third, which was the most important, that in respect of goods supplied to or work and labour done for an infant, the question whether the goods or the work and labour were necessities should be for the court or judge, and not for the jury.—The LORD CHANCELLOR thought the object of the Bill was likely to be beneficial; but, at the same time, he would suggest to the noble Viscount to bring the Bill under the notice of the common law judges, as the persons of the greatest experience in these matters, for the purpose of ascertaining whether they would approve its provisions. The Bill was read a second time.

June 11.—*Supreme Court of Judicature Act (1873)*

*Amendment Bill*.—On the motion for going into committee on this Bill, Lord REDESDALE moved, "That, as it is admitted that this House is preferred by Scotland and Ireland as their Court of Final Appeal to any other which has been proposed, and as a satisfactory court of Final Appeal has not yet been established for England, it will be expedient, instead of proceeding to create a new Court for all the three kingdoms, that the provisions of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act of last session, which prohibit appeal to this House, be repealed, and that time be thereby allowed for the adoption of such improvements in the constitution and practice of this House in the discharge of its judicial functions as may remove the objections which have been taken to it as a Court of Judicature, and that the committee on the Supreme Court of Judicature Act (1873) Amendment Bill be hereby instructed to amend the same in accordance with this resolution." He repeated the arguments used in a previous discussion.—Lord PENZANCE seconded the motion.—The LORD CHANCELLOR opposed the motion. There resolution asked the committee to repeal, not the Judicature Act of last year, but that particular clause of it which prohibited appeals being made to this House. Their Lordships originated the Bill, and invited the House of Commons to make provision for the salaries and expenses of the new



court. The other House accordingly laid upon the Consolidated Fund a charge of £40,000 or £50,000 a year, in consequence of their Lordships intimating their willingness to consent that appeals should no longer come to this House. Was this House now to break faith with the other, and to abandon the proposal on which the other House acted? The resolution laid down two propositions—first, that no satisfactory Court of Final Appeal had been established; and, second, that it was admitted that this House was preferred by Scotland and Ireland as their Court of Final Appeal before any court which had been proposed. That the Court of Final Appeal established by the Act of last year was satisfactory to the people of England was shown by the fact that there was not even a division on its provisions in the other House. He had not heard of any expression of dissatisfaction out of doors on the part of either the people, of the legal profession, or of the judges. His noble friend had utterly failed to make out his proposition with regard to England. As to Scotland and Ireland he maintained that public opinion was silent or acquiescent; professional opinion was divided. The noble lord asked their Lordships, absolutely in the dark, to reverse clear, definite, and intelligible arrangements which they had already passed into law, not upon any alternative suggested, but upon a vague promise that something might be discovered if only they would undo what had been already done. After some observations by Lord MONCRIEFF and Lord O'HAGAN, Lord COLERIDGE said that the Judicature Act had been passed in the House of Commons without a single division upon this point—whether the jurisdiction of the House of Lords should be abandoned. Even in their Lordships' House the only peer who took a division upon it was the noble lord at the table (Lord Redesdale). Therefore, his noble and learned friend on the woolsack was entitled to say that so far as the Legislature was concerned it had pronounced in the clearest manner in favour of the transfer of the jurisdiction of their Lordships' House to the tribunal created by the Judicature Act of last year. He was surprised to hear that this transference had been made without notice to Scotland and Ireland, but if Parliament took away, with the consent of both Houses, the jurisdiction of their Lordships in respect to English tribunals—if that was transferred to a new tribunal, could any man of sense doubt that before long the rest of the jurisdiction would inevitably follow?—Lord SELBORNE asked why did not Scotland and Ireland object last year when English appeals were taken from the House of Lords? The Bill was introduced early. It was delayed that it might be fully considered; nor did the matter pass without warning, for he stated in his speech introducing the measure that his reason for not proposing to include appeals from Scotland and Ireland was that he was not at the time informed of the existence of a state of opinion in those countries which would justify him in making the proposal. He added that he would not conceal his opinion that if the Bill were to pass and the new court to be successful, a not remote consequence would be that the Scotch and Irish appeals would also be attracted to it. The matter, however, did not rest there, for an expression of opinion did proceed from Scotland and Ireland with much greater rapidity than he expected, and when this House had decided on the question of English appeals, and the Bill had passed into the House of Commons, there came from the profession in Scotland and Ireland a pressure to introduce into the Bill such provisions as might be necessary to give Scotland and Ireland the benefit of the new Court of Appeal expressly on the ground—for that was the language in Scotland—that it was expedient the same court of ultimate appeal should decide appeals from both countries. He would ask their Lordships, in the name of common sense, if they were to create an appellate jurisdiction—and if they passed this resolution they must do so, because they would destroy that which was now set up by Act of Parliament—if they were to create *de novo* an appellate jurisdiction for all the causes of this realm, was it conceivable by any human being that they would think it wise to establish a tribunal which should sit at most only six months of the year, and during those six months should be liable to be interrupted by every prorogation, adjournment, and dissolution of Parliament, and which, during those six months, should sit only four days in the week, because the House did not sit the other two? Would they think it right to establish a court in which there would be no certainty of a supply of fit and proper

persons for the administration of justice, and would make it impossible to obtain such a supply unless men were made peers, whether they had fortunes or inclinations suitable or not? To put these questions appeared to reduce the thing to an absurdity. In the new court of ultimate appeal would sit the very same men who would otherwise have administered justice in their Lordships' House, and they would be reinforced by many others. On a division Lord Redesdale's motion was rejected by 52 to 23.

The House then went into committee *pro forma*, but immediately resumed.

*Parochial Records (Ireland) Bill.*—This Bill was read a second time.

*Court of Judicature (Ireland) Bill.*—The House went into committee on this Bill.—The Earl of BELMORE moved the omission in clause 6 of the word "seven," with the view to substitute "eight" for it, his object being, he said, to secure for the Landed Estates Court the services of a second judge.—The LORD CHANCELLOR said he had received a copy of a note sent to the Chief Secretary for Ireland by the learned judge who presided over the court, which stated that there were no arrears whatever, nor was the regular business of the court beyond the power of the judge and his officers to dispose of. In such a state of things the noble lord would judge whether it was the duty of her Majesty's Government to appoint another judge.—The amendment was negatived.—The other clauses of the Bill were then agreed to.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

June 5.—*Licensing Act Amendment Bill.*—The House went into committee on this Bill.

On clause 2, after two amendments had been rejected, Mr. CROSS said he was prepared to accept the amendment which had been placed upon the paper fixing the hours of closing in places with less than 2,500 inhabitants at ten o'clock.

The right hon. gentleman, in answer to a question, said that in all places where beerhouses were now closed at ten o'clock, all licensed houses would be closed at that hour.

The amendment substituting "ten" for "eleven" was agreed to without a division.

In the provision that on Sundays public-houses, wherever situated, should be closed from three p.m. until six p.m., "seven" was substituted for "six," on the recommendation of Mr. CROSS, who promised that the Government would fully consider the matter before the report.

Clause 3 was struck out on the motion of Mr. CROSS, who stated that all its provisions as to hours had been embodied in clause 2.

Clause 4 was agreed to, and on clause 5 Mr. CROSS moved the insertion of words overriding any local Act, in order to clear up a doubt as to the power of opening public-houses in Liverpool at half-past twelve on Sundays instead of one. This was agreed to, and the clause was agreed to.

On clause 6, relating to early-closing licences, the words "or later in the morning" were inserted after the word "night" in line 40. On the understanding that the clause was to be further amended on the report, it was agreed to.

Clauses 7 and 8 were agreed to.

On clause 9, which provides that nothing in the Bill shall preclude a licensed victualler from selling intoxicating liquor at any time to *bonâ fide* travellers or to persons lodging in his house,

Mr. CROSS accepted an amendment that a man should not be regarded as a *bonâ fide* traveller unless he was three miles from his preceding night's lodging, as calculated in a straight line on the Ordnance map. The amendment was adopted, and the clause was agreed to.

Clause 10 was amended and agreed to.

Progress was then reported.

June 8.—*Land Transfer Bills.*—Mr. DISRAELI, in answer to Colonel Barttelot, said he hoped to take the second reading of these Bills on Thursday, the 18th inst.

*The Judicature Act.*—Sir H. JAMES asked the Attorney-General whether he could state when the rules directed

to be framed under the 68th section of the Judicature Act would be laid before the Houses of Parliament; and whether, in the event of no opportunity being afforded for the consideration by Parliament of such rules before they take effect, the Government would introduce a Bill for the purpose of postponing the date on which the Judicature Act shall come into operation.—The ATTORNEY-GENERAL.—I am desirous, in answer to the question of the hon. and learned gentleman, to give a full explanation, as some misapprehension appears to exist as to the rules connected with the Judicature Act of 1873. A code of Rules of Procedure was appended in a schedule to that Act. These rules have been already approved by Parliament, and will come into operation on the commencement of the Act, on the 2nd of November of the present year. A power is given by the 74th section of the Act to the majority of the judges of the Supreme Court to alter or annul these rules at any time after the commencement of the Act (i.e., after the 2nd of November, 1874), and also to make any new rules, after the commencement of the Act, as to practice and procedure. Any rules thus made by the judges, after the 2nd of November, 1874, are to be laid before Parliament in the usual way. In addition, however, to the rules which I have just referred to—viz., rules in the schedule to the Act, and rules to be made by the judges after the 2nd of November, 1874, there is another power given by the 68th section of the Act, to make rules as to procedure, sittings, circuits, and other matters of the same kind. This last-mentioned power must be exercised, if at all, before the 2nd of November, 1874. It is a power given to the Queen in Council, with the advice of the judges or of the greater number of them. The course which has been taken, with a view to the exercise of this power, is this:—A meeting of the judges was held on the 19th of November, 1873, under the presidency of Lord Selborne, then Lord Chancellor. In pursuance of the views of that meeting the services of three draughtsmen were obtained, instructions were given to them on the 25th of November, 1873, and a committee of judges was at the same time appointed to superintend the work and to convene general meetings when necessary. That committee consisted, and consists, of the Lord Chancellor, the three common law chiefs, the Master of the Rolls, Lord Justice Mellish, Vice-Chancellor Hall, Baron Bramwell, Mr. Justice Lush, Mr. Justice Brett, Sir James Hannen, and Sir Robert Phillimore, the Master of the Rolls being the ordinary Chairman of the committee. The draughtsmen have been occupied under this arrangement without intermission. Rules have been prepared by them in three separate batches, and, as each batch has been completed by the draughtsmen, a certain number of copies have been printed, laid before the committee of judges, and by them circulated among such official and representative persons as they thought desirable, and subjected to the revision of the committee. By the 1st of June the draughtsmen, in pursuance of an engagement made by them with the present Lord Chancellor, soon after his accession to office, had completed the rules which they were intended to prepare, with the exception of a few minor and collateral rules which might well be postponed to a later day. The greater portion of these rules have now been considered and revised by the committee of judges, and, on Saturday last, the first meeting of the whole body of judges was held to consider the advice which they should tender to her Majesty on the subject of those rules, and on the subject of sittings, circuits, and vacations. Considerable progress was made at this meeting, and another meeting is to be held on the 1st of July. When the rules are made by her Majesty in Council, they must be laid before Parliament in the usual way, and it is hoped that it may be possible to lay them before Parliament during the present session, and probably by the middle of July. Her Majesty's Government have never contemplated any alteration in the present law under which the Judicature Act is to come into operation on the 2nd November next.

*Licensing Act Amendment Bill.*—The consideration of this Bill in committee was resumed.

Clause 11 was agreed to.

Clause 12, on a division, was carried by 345 to 81.

Clauses 13 to 18 were agreed to.

On clause 19 Mr. Young proposed an amendment allowing provisional orders for the removal of existing

licenses to new premises.—Mr. Cross regarded this as an improvement, and it was agreed to. The clause, as amended, was ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 21, 22, 23, and 24 were agreed to.

Clause 26 was expunged.

On clause 27 an amendment was introduced, defining a town as any urban sanitary district under the Public Health Act (1872), and a parish as any place where a separate poor-rate was or could be made, or where a separate overseer was or could be appointed. The clause, as thus altered, was agreed to, as was also clause 28, the last in the Bill, with some verbal amendments.

A clause, proposed by Mr. RATHBONE, providing for the record of convictions for adulteration, was adopted with a verbal amendment.

Sir E. WATKIN moved a new clause to put an end to all billeting of troops at public-houses after January, 1876. On a division the clause was rejected by 151 to 34.

After clauses proposed by Mr. GREGORY to the effect that no keeper of a public-house should be liable to any penalty for supplying liquor after hours to private friends *bona fide* entertained by him at his own expense and without any charge to them, and by Sir W. HARCOURT to enable magistrates to sanction the transfer of a licence in the case where the former holder had been convicted of felony, had been rejected.

Mr. WATNEY, in the absence of Mr. Gregory, moved a new clause to enable the owner of licensed premises to have licences forfeited without the disqualification of premises, transferred to himself. The clause was agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. Cross two new clauses were added to the Bill extending certain provisions now applicable only to public-houses to beer-houses, and also to enable licensed houses in certain districts to open at an earlier hour during harvest time.

The schedule was then agreed to, the definition of the metropolis in the Act of 1872 having, on the motion of Mr. Cross, been inserted.

The preamble was also agreed to, and the Bill was ordered to be reported.

*Friendly Societies.*—The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER introduced a Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to friendly societies. The Bill, he said, had for its main objects to strengthen and improve the central machinery of registration; to publish correct tables for the use of those societies, and to encourage and as far as possible to enforce a system of periodical valuation. The country would be divided into forty or fifty districts, connected perhaps with the county courts, with officials to receive registrations, and to transmit them to the central office. There were also provisions in the Bill to remove difficulties experienced in the management of the societies. With regard to the Burial Societies, the fact was that those societies existed to a great extent upon lapses, and, among other things, they proposed to place some restrictions upon these lapses. The insurance of the lives of infants under three years of age was to be absolutely prohibited, and insurance of infants above that age was to be restricted. The Bill was read a first time.

*Merchant Shipping (Measurement of Tonnage) Bill.*—This Bill was read a second time.

*Four Courts Marshalsea, Dublin, Bill.*—This Bill passed through committee.

*Board of Trade Arbitrations, Inquiries, &c., Bill.*—This Bill, as amended, was considered.

*Bar Admission Stamp Bill.*—This Bill passed through committee.

*Courts (Colonial) Jurisdiction Bill.*—This Bill passed through committee.

*Militia Law Amendment Bill.*—This Bill was read a second time.

*Municipal Elections Bill.*—This Bill was read a second time and referred to a Select Committee.

*Colonial Clergy Bill.*—This Bill was read a second time and referred to a Select Committee.

*Revenue Officers Disabilities Bill.*—This Bill was read a third time and passed.

*Leases and Sales of Settled Estates Bill.*—This Bill was read a third time and passed.

June 10.—*Building Societies Bill.*—The House went into committee on this Bill.

Clauses 1 to 40 inclusive having been agreed to, the Chairman was ordered to report progress, and the House resumed.

*Personation.*—Mr. G. CLIVE brought in a Bill to render personation, with intent to deprive any person of real estate or other property, felony.

*Labourers' Dwellings.*—Sir P. BURRELL introduced a Bill to give increased facilities for the erection of labourers' and artisans' dwellings.

*Colonial Attorneys.*—Mr. GOLDNEY brought in a Bill to amend the Colonial Attorneys Relief Act.

June 11.—*The Judicature Act.*—Sir G. BOWYER asked the Attorney-General whether the new rules under the Judicature Act could be laid before Parliament previous to the middle of July, as three weeks was not sufficient for Parliament to consider them; and, if not, what course would be pursued for their due consideration by Parliament; and whether the rules regarding pleading had been considered by the judges.—The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said.—In answering the first question of the hon. and learned member, I must not be understood as assenting to the affirmative proposition upon which it is founded—viz., that three weeks would not be sufficient for Parliament to consider the new rules under the Judicature Act. As regards the question itself, I have to state that, though every reasonable exertion has been and will be made to lay the rules before Parliament at as early a period as possible, I think that I should be misleading the House were I to suggest that it is probable that that could be done before the time named by me on Monday last—that is, in the middle of July. I must remind my hon. and learned friend that there is nothing in the Judicature Act of 1873 which requires the new rules to be laid before Parliament during the present session. The Act clearly contemplated the possibility of their coming into operation before they had been submitted to the House. And, in answer to the second question of my hon. and learned friend—viz., "what course will be pursued for the due consideration of the rules by Parliament," I can only state that the course pointed out by the Act of last session will be adhered to. In reply to the third question, "whether the rules regarding pleading have been considered by the judges," I must refer my hon. friend to the very full explanation upon the subject which I gave on Monday last, and which I feel I should not be justified in occupying the time of the House by repeating.

*Militia Law Amendment Bill.*—This Bill went through committee.

*Alkali Act Amendment (1863) Bill.*—This Bill also went through committee.

*Land Tax Commissioners' Names Bill.*—This Bill was read a third time and passed.

*Board of Trade Arbitrations, Inquiries, &c., Bill.*—This Bill was read a third time and passed.

*Bar Admission Stamp Bill.*—This Bill was read a third time and passed.

*Four Courts Marshalsea (Dublin) Bill.*—This Bill was read a third time.

*Apothecaries Act Amendment Bill.*—This Bill passed through committee.

*Building Societies Bill.*—This Bill was recommitted.

On clause 41, Mr. DODDS complained that the Government had, without notice, taken away the exemption of these societies from stamp duty, and moved an amendment to the effect that such exemption should be continued on mortgages for less than £500.—The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER opposed the amendment.—On a division the amendment was negatived by 46 to 14.

The Bill then passed through committee.

It is stated that the Chief Justiceship of the Supreme Court, Natal, has become vacant by the death of the Hon. Walter Hardinge.

The death is announced of Mr. T. B. Addison, one of the oldest of the Lancashire magistrates, and for over half-a-century Recorder of Preston.

In giving evidence a few days ago before the select committee on the Irish jury system, Mr. Thomas Lefroy, chairman of the county of Kildare, said that in a very clear case of assault in his county one jurymen said he would not give a verdict of guilty under the circumstances, and the reason he gave was that he might be guilty of the same offence to-morrow.

## SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

### INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

#### JUDICATURE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The following petition has been agreed upon by the Incorporated Law Society:—

To the Right Honourable the Lords Spiritual and Temporal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled.

The humble petition of the Incorporated Law Society of the United Kingdom.

Sheweth,—That a Bill is now pending in your Right Honourable House, entitled "An Act to amend and extend the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873."

That by the 10th section of the said Bill (sub-section 9) it is provided that any appeal heard before any divisional court other than the first, in the decision of which the judges of the court are not unanimous, shall, if any party to such appeal so desire, be re-heard before the first divisional court.

It appears to your petitioners that the right of appeal to the first divisional court, which is the ultimate court of appeal, should not be thus restricted.

Before the passing of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873, the right of appeal to your Right Honourable House from all decisions of the appellate court in chancery was absolute, and there was also an absolute right of appeal from many of the decisions of the courts of common law; and your petitioners respectfully refer to the comparatively small number of appeals presented to your Lordships' House from the superior courts of law and equity, as showing that the power of thus appealing has not been abused.

The Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873, enacted that every appeal to the court of appeal should be determined either by the whole court or by a divisional court consisting of any number not less than three of the judges thereof, and that any appeal which for any reason might be deemed fit to be re-argued before decision, or to be re-heard before final judgment, might be so re-argued or re-heard before a greater number of judges if the court of appeal thought fit so to direct; but in all other cases the first decision of the court of appeal, or of a divisional court of appeal, was made final.

Your petitioners are apprehensive that the restrictions thus imposed upon a second appeal would, if allowed to take effect, operate injuriously, and that the evil would be but partially remedied by the Bill now pending in your Lordships' House, which, as it now stands, proposes to confine the appeal to the first division or ultimate court of appeal to those cases in which the divisional appellate court is not unanimous.

If the Bill should become law in its present form, cases will probably occur in which the unanimous decision of three judges of great experience and high reputation for learning, composing a court of first instance, will be reversed by a divisional court of appeal also composed of three judges; other cases will doubtless arise in which three judges sitting in a divisional appellate court will take a different view of the law from that expressed by three judges sitting in another divisional appellate court, and yet if the judges of the divisional appellate court before which the appeal has been heard have given their decision, and are unanimous, the suitor will have no right of appeal to the first divisional court, nor will there be any power in any court to give him relief.

Your petitioners believe that under such circumstances dissatisfaction will naturally be felt by the unsuccessful suitors.

Your petitioners would also urge on the consideration of your Lordships that, as the Bill now stands, suitors in Ireland and Scotland will in all cases have the right of two appeals—viz., one to their own appellate court and another to the first division of the proposed court of appeal in this country, and thus be in a different position to suitors in the English courts; and your petitioners would respectfully suggest that it is by no means impossible that the identical matter in controversy may arise as to title to landed property or otherwise in Ireland or Scotland as well as in England, and thus may come by way of



appeal before the first divisional court of appeal after a final and unalterable decision may have been pronounced with respect to the property in England by a divisional court of appeal.

Your petitioners believe that any abuse of the power of appeal would be sufficiently guarded against by confining the right, first, to cases in which the decision of the court of first instance has been reversed by a divisional appellate court; secondly, to cases in which the judges of the divisional appellate court are not unanimous; and, thirdly, to cases in which leave to appeal to the first divisional court is given by that court, or by the divisional appellate court before which the appeal has been heard.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray your Right Honourable House that the said Bill may be amended to the extent of providing that where an original decision is reversed by a divisional court of appeal, or where there has been a want of unanimity among the judges of such court, the suitors should be entitled to appeal to the ultimate or first divisional court of appeal, and that in all other cases the first divisional court of appeal, or the divisional court of appeal by which the case has been decided, should have power to allow a second appeal to the first divisional court of appeal.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

#### INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY OF IRELAND.

##### DEPUTATION TO THE LORD CHANCELLOR.

On Tuesday, June 2nd, a deputation from this society, consisting of Messrs. Anderson, Dix, and Goodman, waited upon the Lord Chancellor at the House of Lords on the subject of the Irish Judicature Act. Lord Belmore having introduced them, they stated the object of their interview. The Lord Chancellor entered freely upon the discussion of the several points referred to in the report of the Council, and afforded the members of the deputation every opportunity of expressing their views upon those questions. The Attorney-General for Ireland was present during the interview, and confirmed, when referred to, the statements of the deputation respecting Irish practice and other local matters not within the personal knowledge of the Lord Chancellor.

#### ASSOCIATED PROVINCIAL LAW SOCIETIES.

The following circular has been issued:—

##### LAND TITLES AND TRANSFER BILL.

Dear Sir,—We enclose report of the proceedings of the meeting of deputations of these societies, held on the 27th of May last, together with observations on the Bill, as settled by the meeting. Amendments on the clauses of the Bill are being prepared by the committee, and will, in due course, be placed in the hands of the members to be entrusted with them. As the Bill will very shortly go into committee of the House of Commons, we may not have the opportunity of writing to you again; we therefore request that you will immediately communicate with your local members, and with any other members of Parliament whom you can influence, and induce them, if possible, to support the amendments to be proposed, giving effect to the first three resolutions passed at the meeting.

As the matter is of great importance, you will please to impress upon any members of Parliament with whom you may communicate, the necessity of carefully considering the resolutions and observations sent herewith. Additional copies will be forwarded on application to us.

A copy of this letter has been sent to every member of the profession.

We have reason to believe that the Council of the Incorporated Law Society concur in the resolutions referred to.

We shall be glad to receive subscriptions in aid of the funds of the associated societies.—We are, dear Sir, yours truly,

WILLIAM A. JEVONS, } Hon. Secs.  
THOMAS MARSHALL, }

#### LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the usual weekly meeting of the society, held on Tuesday evening last at the Law Institution, a large number of members being present, the question for debate was, No. CCXXX., Jurisprudential:—"Is it desirable that the Universities should confer degrees on women?" After a long discussion a motion for the adjournment of the

debate was carried; the debate will therefore be continued on Tuesday next, and take precedence of the question on the paper.

#### THE PRINCE OF WALES AT THE MIDDLE TEMPLE.

On Thursday, the grand day of Trinity Term, his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, who was made a Benchers of the Middle Temple on the opening of the new Library in 1862, dined in the Hall. A numerous and distinguished company of benchers and guests were present, and over 400 members of the Inn sat down to dinner.

The toast of "The Queen" was proposed by the Treasurer, and was drunk with great enthusiasm.

The Treasurer (Mr. Kenyon, Q.C.) next proposed the health of the Prince of Wales. It had been their wish, he said, to be honoured that day in what he hoped was a genial and happy meeting, by the Chancellors and high officers of the Universities of England, Scotland, and Ireland, by leading members of the Council of Legal Education, and by the chiefs and others of the judges of our courts of law and equity. It was an earnest desire of the Inns of Court that their Council and the Universities should cordially co-operate for establishing and carrying on the best system of legal education. If that meeting should tend to generate in them, and through them in the Universities and Inns of Court, a kindly feeling of mutual friendship and a generous co-operation in their common course of education, it could not fail to be a day marked in the future annals of the Inn, from which might be dated, through that friendship, the happy results of sound jurisprudence and legal wisdom adorning and dignifying the Senate, the Bar, and the seat of justice.

The health of the Prince was received with the greatest cordiality, the whole company rising to their feet, and cheering most heartily.

The Prince of Wales, said:—Master Treasurer, my Lords, and Gentlemen,—I beg to tender to you and to my brother benchers my sincere thanks for the kind, hearty, and cordial manner in which you have received this toast. I cannot feel that I am quite a stranger among you, although it is now nearly thirteen years since I had the honour of being enrolled as a member of this Inn. My relations with you are, unfortunately, of an almost entirely honorary character, but I can assure you that I consider it a very high honour to be connected with this Inn. It is, I am sure, a good thing for the profession at large and for the public in general that I have never been called to the bar, for I must say that I could never have been a brilliant ornament of it. I can assure you that I esteem most highly the honour of dining with you and my brother benchers this evening, and with those distinguished men whom I see around me right and left. I entirely agree with every word that has fallen from the lips of our Master Treasurer, and I sincerely hope that this gathering may tend to much good and to bring forward those important results in legal education which you, Sir, have advocated so admirably. I thank you for the kind way in which you have received me, and I can only assure you that it has afforded me the greatest pleasure and satisfaction to meet you here this evening in this ancient hall, where, I am told, Queen Elizabeth once danced with Chancellor Hatton. I am afraid that now-a-days the duties of the Chancellor are more arduous than they were then, and they do not allow him much time to acquire the art of dancing. I cannot help thus reminding you of one of the great historical events which this hall has witnessed, and I thank you once more for the great honour you have done me in proposing my health, and for the cordial reception you have given me.

No other toasts were given.

The following additional circuits have been arranged—viz. Northern, Archibald, J., and Pollock, B.: Appleby, Saturday, July 4; Durham, Tuesday, July 7; Newcastle, Monday, July 13; Carlisle, Saturday, July 18; Lancaster, Thursday, July 23; Manchester, Monday, July 27; Liverpool, Saturday, August 8. Home, Bramwell, B., and Cleasby, B.: Hertford, Wednesday, July 8; Chelmsford, Monday, July 13; Lewes, Thursday, July 16 (at Chelmsford and Lewes civil business will be taken on the commission days); Maidstone, Monday, July 20; Guildford, Monday, July 27.

## LEGAL ITEMS.

In the Convocation of the University of Oxford to be held on Wednesday, June 17, it will be proposed to confer the degree of D.C.L. upon Lord Justice Mellish and Sir Thomas Erskine May, K.C.B., Clerk to the House of Commons.

A meeting was held on Thursday, the 4th ult., under the presidency of Mr. Serjeant Armstrong, with reference to the proposal to place a portrait of the late Lord Chancellor Blackburne, in the hall of the King's Inn, Dublin. A committee was formed to carry the proposal into effect.

On Monday Lord Coleridge, at the sitting of the Court of Common Pleas, said they understood that there were two special cases to be sent up for the opinion of the court in reference to the Boston election petition, and possibly there might be other matters of the same kind pending, so that the court would take power to sit in banco on every day between the end of term and the 8th July—not really to sit, but to take power to sit on all those days; and they would sit on any days that they could before they went circuit, for the purpose of disposing of election petitions. It must, therefore, be understood that at any time between the present and the commencement of the circuits, counsel might be called upon to argue these causes. The court considered it its first duty to dispose of questions arising upon election petitions, and it would be most inconvenient that any such cause should go over the Long Vacation.

At the banquet given by the Lord Mayor to the judges on Wednesday evening, Lord Coleridge in responding to the toast of "Her Majesty's Judges," said—I hope we may say that, at least as a body, we are clear in our great office; that we always remember what is due to others as well as to ourselves; that we recollect that we are paid and appointed not merely to determine, but to hear, and that anything like vanity or discourteous arrogance may destroy the value of even great legal learning and cast a shade on even the highest integrity. This I know—speaking for myself—that I never had the least idea how difficult it was to be a judge until, for the misfortune of others, I had to be one." He added, "I have seen that two distinguished friends of mine in different places have suggested the probable postponement of the Judicature Act for another year; but, if they know that, they know more than I do; and, as far as I can judge, it is most likely that the Judicature Act will come into operation in November next."

The *Albany Law Journal* prints the following observations of Mr. Justice Nott, in delivering the opinion of the Court of Claims, upon the application of Mrs. Lockwood to be admitted to practise as an attorney. The learned judge remarked: "I have been at the bar and in the military service, and my experience leads me to the conclusion that women are as well fitted for the one as for the other. Another person having had similar experiences may reach an opposite result. It is said that modern ideas have brought down many occupations within the reach of women, which were supposed to belong exclusively to men; but in nothing have modern ideas done so much of this levelling as in the art of war. In the hand-to-hand conflicts of antiquity women were manifestly unable to cope with the physical natures of men, and from necessity were exempt. But hand-to-hand conflicts are as obsolete as the wager of battle. The light breech-loading carbine demands activity rather than strength. Woman, as a soldier, would have little to do besides marching and shooting and being shot. It is said that a well-bred, intelligent, honest woman will make a better attorney than an ignorant, vicious, unscrupulous man. This is true; but it is equally true that a healthy, active woman will make a better soldier than a decrepit man. Some considerations of public policy also intervene in favour of the latter course."

A writer in the *Daily News* gives the following description of the new French Minister of Justice:—"M. Tailhand was never a great nor even an effective speaker, for a slight impediment in his speech, which he retains to this day, rendered his delivery slow and often inarticulate; but few men were so quick to detect the weak points in an adversary's case. His knowledge of the civil and criminal codes, but especially of the latter, was so thorough, that he was supposed to be able to quote any article in either of them verbatim; and as he was nice in his selection of cases, refusing to accept briefs where he saw no chance of success, the clients fortunate enough to have him on their side were re-

puted certain of victory. After a short and remunerative career, M. Tailhand applied for promotion to the bench, and readily obtained an assessorship, worth about £160 a year. This was not a brilliant rise; but French judges always work their way up from small beginnings; and, besides, as M. Tailhand had never been retained in any sensational trial, and as his unfortunate defect of tongue precluded him from pushing to the foremost rank at the bar, nobody thought he had derogated in accepting this provincial judgeship. On the bench his mastery of legal technicalities stood him in even better stead than before, and in due time he rose to a Chief Judgeship at Privas, where he became known as a man of inflexible uprightness and unsparing severity. It fared ill with political delinquents who were brought before him, and it would have gone still harder with any party to a civil suit who should have come to him privately in the hope of coaxing or bribing him. This fact is noteworthy, for secret appeals are by no means thrown away upon all French judges. In a country where the highest judicial officer—the President of the Court of Cassation in Paris—receives but 30,000 francs (the salary of a London police magistrate), many judges cannot—let it be said with compunction—afford to be incorruptible. Sometimes, when they are struggling men with large families, money will tempt them; in other cases the promise of promotion held out by an unscrupulous suitor having influence in Government circles, will be too much for their feelings; very few of them are proof against that scarlet ribbon of the Legion of Honour flashed seductively before their eyes. If the English reader winces at the notion of judges yielding to corrupt temptations, he may be reminded that civil causes in France are not tried before a jury, and that the law inflicts heavy penalties on newspapers which venture to criticise the finding of a judge, all of which makes the bench virtually omnipotent and irresponsible. Now omnipotence, irresponsibility, and low pay have never yet worked well together; and the French have every cause to envy the British system of paying judges generously, and hedging them about with precautions in the way of unanimous juries and a free press."

## LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

## CALLS TO THE BAR.

The undermentioned gentlemen were on Saturday called to the Bar:—

LINCOLN'S INN.—John Gent, M.A., Oxford, Fellow of Trinity College; Arthur Fraser Walter, B.A., Oxford; John Goode, University of London; Harry Greenwood, B.A., Cambridge; Henry Yorke Stanger, B.A., Oxford, Tancred Law Student; Robert Kedington Rodwell, M.A., Cambridge, Fellow of Emmanuel College; Edward Pengree; George Henderson, M.A., Cambridge, Fellow of Pembroke College; Robert Welch Mackreth; John Theodore Dodd, M.A., Oxford; Francis Edward Armitstead, B.A., Oxford; Louis Edgar Agostini, University of London; Aldred William Rowden, Balliol College, Oxford; Charles Edward Cree, B.A., Oxford; Goronoske Yoshiyama, of Nagato, Japan; Cumbumpati Sabapathi Iyah, University of Madras; and Montagu Clementi, Captain Bengal Staff Corps, Esq.

INNER TEMPLE.—Henry Gribble Turner; Arthur Cordery, B.A., Oxford; Thomas Stewart Omond, M.A., Edinburgh and Oxford, Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford; Adam Henry Bittleston, B.A., S.C.L., Oxford; Seymour Henry Knyvett, B.A., Oxford; George John Courthope, B.A., Oxford; Frederick Henry Thomas Streetfield; Edward William Hawker, LL.B., B.A., Cambridge; George Mallows Freeman, B.A., Oxford; William Ward Cook, B.A., Oxford; Herbert Baring Garrod, B.A., Oxford; William Denman Benson, B.A., Oxford; Richard Ord, Oxford; Harry Chadwick, B.A., Oxford; Jasper Myers Richardson, B.A., Cambridge; Thomas Shepherd Little, B.A., Cambridge; Walter Long Boreham, M.A., Cambridge; Eunastie Morphett, B.A., Oxford; George Pearson Wheeler, B.A., Dublin; Edward Crofton, M.A., Oxford; John Francis Walker, M.A., Cambridge; John Henry Polly Simpson, Cambridge; Frank Ricardo, B.A., Cambridge; Henry Tullie Rivaz; John Edward Courtenay Bodley, Oxford; Augustus Mirams, Cambridge; William Evans, B.A., Oxford; John Francis Jerrard, London; Walter Lawry Buller; Charles Edward Eardley Childers, B.A., Cambridge; George M'Watters, B.A., Queen's Univer-

sity, Ireland; Thomas von Donop Hardinge, B.A., Dublin  
Thomas Edward Fairfax; and George Douglas Harris,  
Esqs.

MIDDLE TEMPLE.—William Charles Boden Elwell, Uni-  
versity College, Oxford, B.A.; Ainslie Douglas Ainslie;  
William Wallace Rodger, of Exeter College, Oxford;  
Captain Edward Gladstone; Edward Henry Palmer, of St.  
John's College, Cambridge, M.A.; Claude Fitzroy Wade,  
of Magdalen College, Oxford, B.A.; Walter Meyrick  
North, of Brasenose College, Oxford; Robert Townley  
Caldwell, of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, M.A.;  
William Ogle Grey Younghusband; Frederick York Powell,  
of Christ Church, Oxford, B.A.; Vivian Montague Stanley  
Reed; James Webster Bird; Philip Morton; Horatio  
Nelson Lay, C.B.; Charles Stubbs, of Corpus Christi College,  
Cambridge, B.A., LL.B.; Arthur Frank Byas, of Trinity  
College, Cambridge; Alexander Charles Nicoll; Charles  
Clare Scott; John Page Middleton, of Trinity Hall, Cam-  
bridge; Charles Henderson Scott; William Henry Charles  
Wilson, of the University of London; Samuel Archibald  
Locke; Francis Henry Dillen Bell, of St. John's College,  
Cambridge, B.A.; Robert Wallace, of Dublin University,  
B.A.; Colonel John Elliot; Robert Philpot, of Trinity  
College, Cambridge, B.A.; Francis Alfred Carter; Lewis  
O'Neill; Lieutenant Mering Bloomfield Leager, and  
George William Cline, LL.D., F.G.S., Esqs.

#### UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

SCHOOL OF JURISPRUDENCE.—TRINITY TERM, 1874.

##### CLASS LIST.

I.	
Allison, W., Balliol.	Deacon, E. A., Exeter.
Eastwick, J., Trinity.	Ferard, C. A., Trinity.
Whitmore, C. A., Balliol.	Lawrence, J. N., Christ Ch.
II.	
Brunning - Maddison, F., Brasenose.	Trotter, E. B., University.
Coolidge, W. A. B., Exeter.	Vawdrey, D., C. C. C.
Hardy, G. H., Christ Church.	Wilke, J. D., Brasenose.
Robin, A. H., New College.	Williams, J., Lincoln.
Stuart-Wortley, C. B., Balliol.	Young, J. F., Brasenose.
III.	
Bellairs, H. L., Worcester.	Cree, A. W., Exeter.
Examiners—J. Bryce, H. S. Maine, and T. E. Holland.	Lempriere, E. P., St. John's.
	Whitefoord, B., New College.

#### ARTICLED CLERKS WHO PASSED THEIR FINAL EXAMINATION.

Easter Term, 1874.

Ainsworth, Arthur Eccles	De Caux, Wm., jun
Attenborough, Chas. Leete	Draper, Edwd. Danvers
Barrs, Wm	Drew, Chas
Bartlett, Jno	Duncan, Geo. Rix
Batten, Hy. Butler, B.A.	Dyson, Thos. Arthur
Beale, Edwd	Elliott, Albert Augustine,
Beck, Wm. Michael	B.A.
Belk, Stephen Herbert	Essex, Rd. Arthur
Billing, Saml	Eve, Chas
Blaker, Evelyn Boner	Eyre, Chas. Lewis
Boyle, Wm	Few, Jno. Wilton
Bramwell, Thos. Young	Flemming, Thos. Walter
Brothers, Fras. Wm	Francis, Thos. Musgrave
Brown, Harry	French, Saml. Mosley
Bullock, Herbert	Gardner, Walter Silvester
Burt, Percival Johnson	Gemmell, Thos., B.A.
Butler, Rd. Lovell	George, Thos. Sanderson
Carpenter, Alfd. Sturgis	Gheat, Jno
Cartwright, Wm. Edwd	Gibbons, Alfred Wm
Clegg, Wm. Edwd	Gibson, Albert
Collins, Philip Geo	Good, Thos
Commans, Jno. Edden	Gosselin, Hellier
Cooke, Fk. Meredith	Gray, Geo. Fk
Cooper, Wm. Way, B.A.	Green-Armitage, Alfd
Coppock, Russell	Gregon, Jno. Hy
Cousins, Harry	Guy, Walter Jas
Cox, Wm	Haines, Alfd
Curtis, Jas., jun	Hall, Geo. Hall
Danger, Wm	Hales, Jno. Balseley Tooke
Daly, Wm. Hy	Hardingham, Arthur Sh or
Davies, Harry	ridge
Davis, Conrad Jno	Harvey, Bridges

Hayes, Alfd. Davye  
Henderson, Alfd  
Hennessey, Chas. Payne  
Hocking, Thos. Gilbert  
James, Chas. Russell  
Johnson, Wm  
Jones, Wm. Robt. Lloyd  
Julius. Villiers Alexr  
Jnpp, Richd Franklin  
Kenyon, Jas  
Lacey, Chas. Jas  
Lakeman, Jno. Ball  
Latham, Hy., jun., B.A.  
Lawes, Claudius Fras  
Lewin, Chas. Hy  
Linay, Saml  
Little, Edwd. Palling  
Livett, Geo. Chaplin  
McCraith, Jas. Wm  
Mackenzie, Hy. Tireman  
Marcy, Arthur  
Marten, Alexr  
Mitchell, Fredk  
Moore, Arthur Chisholm  
Mortimer, Chas. Edwd  
Musson, Wm. Alfd  
Newton, Fras  
Nightingale, Jas  
Ogden, Jno  
Palmer, Walter Howitt  
Palmer, Wm. White  
Parkinson, Jno. Broadfield

Pearce, Thos  
Pettengill, Jas  
Pitt, Wm. Alfd  
Procter, Gilbert  
Pryce, Chas. Alfd  
Quekett, Alfd. Jas. South  
Radford, Alfd. Harvey  
Rawlins, Percy Lionel  
Rossiter, Thos. Wm  
Row, Thos  
Sargent, Zwingli  
Sewell, Edwd. Clare  
Simpson, Jno. Chapman  
Stanbury, Herbt. Wm  
Steward, Thos. Hy  
Strapp, Wm. Jas  
Sutcliffe, Chas. Edwin  
Tennant, Jno., jun  
Theed, Arthur Gibson  
Thomas, Rice Powell  
Tinné, Jas. Capellen, M.A.  
Ward, Wm. Fras  
Watkin, Jno. Woodland  
Watts, Josh. Jno  
Wellborne, Chas. Evelyn  
Wilkin, Wm., jun  
Willett, Edwd  
Williams, Edwd  
Wilson, Jno. Bolton  
Worth, Jno. Thos  
Young, Walter, L.L.B.

#### Trinity Term, 1874.

Abbott, Frederick James	Driffeld, Edwd. Townshend
Adams, Frederick Glynn	Drummond, Charles John
Addyman, Jas. Wilson, B.A.	Durbidge, George
Allan, Charles George	Emmot, Christopher Fredc.
Anderson, Fras. Henry	Evans, James Fothergill
Aslington, Henry, jun.	Fagg, Alfred
Auty, Samuel Bates	Fell, Arthur
Baily, Henry George, jun.	Fisher, Thomas, jun.
Baker, Fras. John	Flower, John Henry
Barber, Robert	Forster, Charles Davison
Barrett, James Salter	Fox, William Scott
Beech, Josh.	Frost, Dennis Tregosse
Benjamin, Nathaniel Hyman	Garden, Frederic
Biggin, Edward Henry	Geddes, Charles Edward
Binns, Edmund Knowles	Gibson, John Frederick
Biscoe, Frederick William	Girling, Thomas Barker
Black, Arthur	Glaishy, Edward
Boddington, Wm. Slater	Godby, Michael John
Bolingbroke, Louis Errington	Godlee, Arthur
Borlase, John James	Gray, William Edward
Bowly, Fras. Hamilton	Grellon, William Arthur
Boyd, George Fenwick	Gregon, Richard
Brooke, Robert	Hales, John Arthur
Brown, Richard Snea	Haley, Josh.
Bruxner, Henry Robt., B.A.	Hancock, Edwin Moore
Bridge, Philip Edwd. Lionel	Hancock, Robert Edward
Burgess, Richard, jun.	Harle, William
Burtonshaw, William	Harrison, Henry
Carr, Robert James Ewing	Heathfield, William Henry
Castle, George	Hewson, William Henry
Chalinder, Edward	Hicks, William
Chamberlain, Lionel Percy	Hilbery, Henry
Chamberlin, Peter	Hill, Frederic
Clark, Alfred	Holden, Arthur Thomas
Clowes, John Storey	Holden, George Henry
Cobbett, Wm. Vines Holt	Holden, William Stackhouse
Collard, George	Horne, George Bernard
Cragg, Richard Balderston	Hooper, William Hope
Crane, Charles Henry	Jackson, Andrew Marvel
Crowdy, James, jun., B.A.	Jolliffe, Arthur
Crowther, George Oastler	Jones, Frederick George
Crutwell, Walter Harry	Evans
Wilson	Jones, Henry William
Davies, John David	Jones, John Henry
Davis, Edward Charles	Keeping, Tom Jeffery
Davis, James	Keith, Herbert
Douglas, Thomas	Kemp, Alfred Charles
Drew, Lancelot	King, George Lamb



Lamb, Charles Edward	Roberts, Robt. Jones
Tranter	Rooke, Alexr. Fredk
Lane, William Henry	Roskell, Aloysius Josh.
Lee, Edward Henry	Rouse, Edwd. Peter
Lewes, Edward Llanfair	Rowsett, Hy. Bishop
Llewellyn, Arthur Price	Rubenstein, Maurice Saml
Lock, Robert	Sanderson, Chas. Augs.
Lomas, Charles	Scott, Walter
Lynch, Blosse H. Francis	Soowcroft, Walter
Makepeace, Thomas	Shield, Josh. Ridley
Marshall, George	Shepard, Jno. Alexr
Martin, Thomas Fk.	Shittler, Jno. Robt
Massey, Josh.	Sidney, Marlow Wm
Matthews, John Gunter	Smith, Chas. Fredk
Maud, Edward Fletcher	Smith, Geo. Green
Maurice, Edward Arthur	Smith, Jas. Edwd
Bonnor	Smith, Thos. Leadlay
May, Morgan	Speakman, Edwd. Mackenzie
Mennell, Philip	Sprott, Jas. Hy
Merredith, John F. J.	Stephenson, Hy. Goodwyn
Michelmores, Thomas Wilson	Swaffield, Silvester Edwd
Milburn, Edward	Sykes, Benj. Corless
Miles, Arthur Stuart	Taylor, Fras. Jas
Montague, Charles Arthur	Taylor, Wm. Hy
Haythorne	Terrell, Gilbert Howard
Molynaux, Edwin Henry	Thomas, John
Morris, John Whitlock	Thomas, William Ramsay
Morton, Charles Henry	Thompson, James Ormerod
Nash, Henry Morgan	Thompson, William, jun.
Newstead, Edward Flash-	Tibbits, Clement William
man	Tibbits, James George
Ollard, Gerald Augustus	Tillett, Edward Arthur
Orford, Charles Thomas	Tompson, Charles Hardy
Ormerod, Edward Stanley	Trevanion, Henry Thomas
Owen, Morris	Turner, George Sidney
Owles, Eustace William	Vaughan, George Lingard
Page, Fk. Brookes	Wade, Charles Aubrey
Page, Henry Daniel Moody	Wade, John
Papworth, Oliver	Walker, John Charles
Parish, Henry	Wayman, Harry
Parker, Henry John	Wayman, Harry Gooch
Pearson, Edward Spencer	Wearing, James
Philpots, Thomas Henry	Weld, Henry Corbin
Pitta, Alfred Julian	Whall, Charles Albert
Potter, Henry Samuel	Wheatcroft, John
Poyser, Hampden Alphonse	White, Luke
Kossuth	Whitworth, Reginald
Preston, Thomas Parkinson	Wigmore, Edward
Pybus, William Mark	Wilkins, Henry
Quick, Robert	Willcocks, John Love
Rathbone, Alfred Henry	Williams, Harry Montague
Richardson, Morris, B.A.	Williams, James
Riley, Hy. Lindon	Wood, John Richardson
Rivolta, Jno. Ledbrook	Williams, Harry M.

## PUBLIC COMPANIES.

## RAILWAY STOCK.

Railways.	Paid.	Closing Price
Stock Bristol and Exeter .....	100	123
Stock Caledonian .....	100	94
Stock Glasgow and South-Western .....	100	—
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock .....	100	45½
Stock Great Northern .....	100	128½
Stock Do., A Stock .....	100	154
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland .....	100	109
Stock Great Western—Original .....	100	121½
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire .....	100	144½
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast .....	100	79
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover .....	100	21½
Stock London and North-Western .....	100	145
Stock London and South Western .....	100	112½
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln .....	100	69½
Stock Metropolitan .....	100	60
Stock Do., District .....	100	24½
Stock Midland .....	100	128
Stock North Eastern .....	100	61½
Stock North London .....	100	109
Stock North Staffordshire .....	100	64
Stock South Devon .....	100	65
Stock South-Eastern .....	100	111½

\* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

## GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

Last Quotation, June 12, 1874.

3 per Cent. Consols, 92½d	Annuities, April, '85 9½
Ditto for Account, July 92½d	Do. (Red Sea T.), Aug. 180s
3 per Cent. Reduced 92½	Ex Billa, £1000. 2½ per Ct. par
New 3 per Cent., 92½	Ditto, £500. Do par
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £100 & £200, par
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Bank of England Stock, 5
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '78	Ct. (last half-year) 259
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	Ditto for Account.

## INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80 107½d	Ditto, ½ per Cent., May, '79 102
Ditto for Account. —	Ditto Debentures, per Cent.,
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct '85 102½	April, '64 —
Ditto, ditto, Certificates, —	Do. Do, 5 per Cent., Aug. '78 100½
Ditto Ranfaced Ppr., 1 per Cent. 96½	Do. Bonds, 4 per Ct., £1000
Ind. Inf. Pr., 5 p C., Jan. '72	Ditto, ditto, under £1000

## MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

There has been no change in the Bank rate. The proportion of reserve to liabilities has risen from 43½ to about 45 per cent. Since last Friday there has been considerable heaviness in the railway market, and prices have declined. Erie shares fell on Tuesday on a report that Mr. Watson had resigned the presidency. In the foreign market there has been some flatness in speculative stocks and Turkish have fallen on the announcement of a new loan. Consols on Thursday 92½ to ½ for delivery, and 92½ to ½ for July.

## ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

## AT THE MART.

JUNE 5.—By Messrs. CORB.

Kent, near Rochester—Freehold marsh land, 87a. 0r. 4p.—sold for £5,250.  
Near Greenhithe—The Knockholt Farm, containing 43a. 2r. 38p., freehold—sold for £5,100.

JUNE 8.—By Messrs. REYNOLDS and EASON.

Cheapside.—Nos. 4 and 5, Addele-street, freehold, sold for £6,910.  
Shoreditch.—Nos. 183, 184, and 185, High-street, freehold—sold for £8,620.

JUNE 9.—By Messrs. FULLER and MOON.

Redhill—The Royal Oak Hotel, term 68 years—sold for £1,700.

By Messrs. WEATHERALL and GREEN.

Kensington.—Nos. 1 to 5, West-Mall, and Nos. 28, 29, and 30, Silver-street, copyhold—sold for £2,300.

By Messrs. ELLIS and SON.

Camberwell-green.—Nos. 20 to 24, freehold—sold for £2,650.

By Messrs. COOPER and GOULDING.

Sussex, near Uckfield.—Pale House Farm, containing 42a. 2r. 39p.—sold for £2,740.  
Edgware-road—Cavendish-road, Cavendish-villa, term 92 years—sold for £950.

By Messrs. CHINNOCK, GALSORTHY, and CHINNOCK.

Charing-cross.—Nos. 46 and 47, and Nos. 25 and 27, Spring-gardens, freehold—sold for £30,000  
New Bond-street—No. 148, with stabling, City leasehold—sold for £9,000.

By Messrs. FAREBROTHER, CLARK, and Co.

Middlesex, near Sunbury—The residence, Charlton Cottage, and three acres, freehold—sold for 1,500.  
Hendon—A plot of land, containing 1a. 0r. 30p., freehold—sold for £390.

By Messrs. WINSTANLEY and HORWOOD.

Clapham-common.—Nos. 13 to 16, The Pavement, freehold—sold for £3,250.  
Middlesex—Highwood-hill, an enclosure of land, containing 24a. 3r. 35p., freehold—sold for £5,150.

Sussex—Brighton, freehold ground rent of £80 per annum—sold for £1,590.

Clapham—No. 48, High-street, term 36 years—sold for £565.

By Messrs. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, and FARMER.

South Wales, near Abergavenny—The freehold residence, Aberbaiden, and 45a. 1r. 6p.—sold for £7,500.  
Highbury.—Nos. 6 and 7, Highbury-park, freehold—sold for £4,110.

## AT THE GUILDHALL TAVERN.

JUNE 2.—By Messrs. MARSH, YETTS, and MILNER.

Drury-lane—Two renter's shares—sold for £230.

## COURT PAPERS

## HIGH COURT OF CHANCERY.

*Sittings After Trinity Term, 1874.*

## ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	LORD CHANCELLOR.	MASTER OF THE ROLLS.	LORDS JUSTICES.	V. C. MALINS.	V. C. BACON.	V. C. HALL.	CERTIFICATES OF SALE AND TRANSFER.
12TH WEEK.							
Monday, June 15	Mr. Pemberton	Mr. Latham	Mr. King	Mr. Farrer	Mr. Holdship	Mr. Merivale	Mr. Ward
Tuesday ..... 16	Ward	Leach	Disraeli	Rogers	Teesdale	Milne	Latham
Wednesday... 17	Pemberton	Latham	King	Farrer	Holdship	Merivale	Milne
Thursday ... 18	Ward	Leach	Disraeli	Rogers	Teesdale	Milne	King
FIRST DAY OF THE SITTINGS.							
Friday..... 19	Pemberton	Latham	King	Farrer	Holdship	Merivale	Rogers
Saturday..... 20	Ward	Leach	Disraeli	Rogers	Teesdale	Milne	Holdship
1ST WEEK.							
Monday ..... 22	Leach	Merivale	Rogers	Holdship	Ward	Disraeli	Latham
Tuesday ..... 23	Latham	Milne	Farrer	Teesdale	Pemberton	King	Merivale
Wednesday... 24	Leach	Merivale	Rogers	Holdship	Ward	Disraeli	King
Thursday ... 25	Latham	Milne	Farrer	Teesdale	Pemberton	King	Rogers
Friday..... 26	Leach	Merivale	Rogers	Holdship	Ward	Disraeli	Teesdale
Saturday..... 27	Latham	Milne	Farrer	Teesdale	Pemberton	King	Ward
2ND WEEK.							
Monday ..... 29	Merivale	Disraeli	Holdship	Ward	Latham	Farrer	Milne
Tuesday ..... 30	Milne	King	Teesdale	Pemberton	Leach	Rogers	Disraeli
Wednesday, July 1	Merivale	Disraeli	Holdship	Ward	Latham	Farrer	Rogers
Thursday ... 2	Milne	King	Teesdale	Pemberton	Leach	Rogers	Holdship
Friday..... 3	Merivale	Disraeli	Holdship	Ward	Latham	Farrer	Pemberton
Saturday..... 4	Milne	King	Teesdale	Pemberton	Leach	Rogers	Latham
3RD WEEK.							
Monday ..... 6	Disraeli	Farrer	Pemberton	Latham	Milne	Teesdale	King
Tuesday ..... 7	King	Rogers	Ward	Leach	Merivale	Holdship	Farrer
Wednesday, July 8	Disraeli	Farrer	Pemberton	Latham	Milne	Teesdale	Holdship
Thursday ... 9	King	Rogers	Ward	Leach	Merivale	Holdship	Pemberton
Friday..... 10	Disraeli	Farrer	Pemberton	Latham	Milne	Teesdale	Leach
Saturday ... 11	King	Rogers	Ward	Leach	Merivale	Holdship	Milne
4TH WEEK.							
Monday ..... 13	Rogers	Teesdale	Leach	Milne	King	Pemberton	Farrer
Tuesday ..... 14	Farrer	Holdship	Latham	Merivale	Disraeli	Ward	Teesdale
Wednesday... 15	Rogers	Teesdale	Leach	Milne	King	Pemberton	Ward
Thursday ... 16	Farrer	Holdship	Latham	Merivale	Disraeli	Ward	Leach
Friday..... 17	Rogers	Teesdale	Leach	Milne	King	Pemberton	Merivale
Saturday..... 18	Farrer	Holdship	Latham	Merivale	Disraeli	Ward	King
5TH WEEK.							
Monday ..... 20	Holdship	Pemberton	Merivale	King	Rogers	Leach	Teesdale
Tuesday ..... 21	Teesdale	Ward	Milne	Disraeli	Farrer	Latham	Pemberton
Wednesday... 22	Holdship	Pemberton	Merivale	King	Rogers	Leach	Latham
Thursday ... 23	Teesdale	Ward	Milne	Disraeli	Farrer	Latham	Merivale
Friday..... 24	Holdship	Pemberton	Merivale	King	Rogers	Leach	Disraeli
Saturday..... 25	Teesdale	Ward	Milne	Disraeli	Farrer	Latham	Rogers
6TH WEEK.							
Monday ..... 27	Ward	Leach	Disraeli	Rogers	Teesdale	Milne	Pemberton
Tuesday ..... 28	Pemberton	Latham	King	Farrer	Holdship	Merivale	Leach
Wednesday... 29	Ward	Leach	Disraeli	Rogers	Teesdale	Milne	Merivale
Thursday ... 30	Pemberton	Latham	King	Farrer	Holdship	Merivale	Disraeli
Friday..... 31	Ward	Leach	Disraeli	Rogers	Teesdale	Milne	Farrer
Saturday, Aug. 1	Pemberton	Latham	King	Farrer	Holdship	Merivale	Teesdale
7TH WEEK.							
Monday ..... 3	Latham	Milne	Farrer	Teesdale	Pemberton	King	Leach
Tuesday ..... 4	Leach	Merivale	Rogers	Holdship	Ward	Disraeli	Milne
Wednesday... 5	Latham	Milne	Farrer	Teesdale	Pemberton	King	Disraeli
Thursday ... 6	Leach	Merivale	Rogers	Holdship	Ward	Disraeli	Farrer
Friday..... 7	Latham	Milne	Farrer	Teesdale	Pemberton	King	Holdship
Saturday..... 8	Leach	Merivale	Rogers	Holdship	Ward	Disraeli	Pemberton

## SITTINGS AFTER TRINITY TERM, 1874.

## LORD CHANCELLOR.

Lincoln's Inn.

Friday, June 19  
Monday ..... 22 } Appeals.  
Tuesday ..... 23 }  
Wednesday... 24 { App. mtns., petns. & apps.

Thursday ... 25 }  
Friday ..... 26 } Appeals.  
Monday ..... 29 }  
Tuesday ..... 30 }  
Wednesday July 1 { App. mtns., petns. & apps.  
Thursday ... 2 }  
Friday ..... 3 } Appeals.

Monday ..... 6 } Appeals  
Tuesday ..... 7 }  
Wednesday... 8 { App. mtns., petns. & apps.  
Thursday... 9 }  
Friday ..... 10 } Appeals.  
Monday ..... 13 }  
Tuesday ..... 14 }

Wednesday... 15 { App. mtns., petns. & apps.  
Thursday... 16 }  
Friday ..... 17 } Appeals.  
Monday ..... 20 }  
Tuesday ..... 21 }  
Wednesday... 22 { App. mtns., petns. & apps.

Thursday ..23 } Appeals.  
 Friday ..24 }  
 Monday ..27 }  
 Tuesday ..28 }  
 Wednesday 29 } App.mtns. & ptns. & apps.  
 Thursday ..30 }  
 Friday ..31 } Appeals.  
 Notice.—Such days as his Lordship shall be engaged in the House of Lords are excepted.

## MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

Chancery Lane.

Friday June 1 { The First Seal.—  
 Mtns. & gen. pa.  
 Ptns. sht causes  
 Saturday ..20 } adj. sums, & gen  
 pa.  
 Monday ..22 } General paper.  
 Tuesday ..23 }  
 Wednesday ..24 }  
 Thursday ..25 } The Second Seal.—  
 Mtns. & gen. pa.  
 Friday ..26 } Ptns. sht. caus.  
 Saturday ..27 } adj. sums, and  
 gen. pa.  
 Monday ..29 } General paper.  
 Tuesday ..30 }  
 Wednesday July 1 }  
 Thursday ..2 } The Third Seal.—  
 Mtns. & gen. pa.  
 Friday ..3 } General paper.  
 Saturday ..4 } Ptns. sht. ca. us.  
 adj. sums, &  
 gen. pa.  
 Monday ..6 }  
 Tuesday ..7 } General paper.  
 Wednesday ..8 }  
 Thursday ..9 } The Fourth Seal.—  
 Mtns. & gen. pa.  
 Friday ..10 } Ptns. sht. caus.  
 Saturday ..11 } adj. sums, and  
 general paper.  
 Monday ..13 }  
 Tuesday ..14 } General paper.  
 Wednesday ..15 }  
 Thursday ..16 } The Fifth Seal.—  
 Mtns. & gen. pa.  
 Friday ..17 } Ptns. sht. causes,  
 adj. sums, & gen.  
 pa.  
 Saturday ..18 }  
 Monday ..20 }  
 Tuesday ..21 } General paper.  
 Wednesday ..22 }  
 Thursday ..23 } The Sixth Seal.—  
 Mtns. & gen. pa.  
 Friday May 24 } General paper.  
 Saturday ..25 } Ptns. sht. caus.  
 adj. sums, & gen.  
 pa.  
 Monday ..27 }  
 Tuesday ..28 } General paper.  
 Wednesday ..29 }  
 Thursday ..30 } The Seventh Seal.—  
 Mtns. & gen. pa.  
 Friday ..31 } Remaining Motns  
 & adj. sums.  
 Notice.—His Honour will hear Further Considerations, as part of the General Paper, in priority to Original Causes, but will not give them precedence of any Cause or matter that has already appeared in the Paper.

N.B.—Unopposed petitions must be presented and copies left with the Secretary, on or before the Thursday preceding the Saturday on which it is intended they should be heard; and any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the necessary papers left in Court with the Judge's Officer the day before the cause comes into the paper.

## LORDS JUSTICES.

Lincoln's Inn.

Friday June 19. Bkt. apps. & apps.  
 Saturday ..20 } Ptns. in lunacy  
 & app. ptns.  
 Monday ..22 } Appeals.  
 Tuesday ..23 }  
 Wednesday ..24 } App.mtns. & apps  
 Thursday ..25 } Appeals.  
 Friday ..26 } Bkt. apps. & apps.

Saturday ..27 } Ptns. in luna c  
 and appl. ptns.  
 Monday ..29 } Appeals.  
 Tuesday ..30 }  
 Wednesday July 1 } App.mtns. & apps.  
 Thursday ..2 } Appeals.  
 Friday ..3 } Bkt. apps. & apps.  
 Saturday ..4 } Ptns. in lunacy &  
 app. ptns.  
 Monday ..6 } App. als.  
 Tuesday ..7 }  
 Wednesday ..8 } App.mtns. & apps  
 Thursday ..9 } Appeals.  
 Friday ..10 } Bkt. apps. & apps.  
 Saturday ..11 } Ptns. in lunacy  
 & app. ptns.  
 Monday ..13 }  
 Tuesday ..14 } Appeals.  
 Wednesday ..15 } App Motns & Apps  
 Thursday ..16 } Appeals.  
 Friday ..17 } Bkt Apps & Apps  
 Saturday ..18 } Ptns in Lunacy &  
 App Ptns.  
 Monday ..20 }  
 Tuesday ..21 } Appeals.  
 Wednesday ..22 } App.mtns. & apps.  
 Thursday ..23 } Appeals.  
 Friday ..24 } Bkt. apps & apps.  
 Saturday ..25 } Ptns. in lunacy  
 & appl. ptns.  
 Monday ..27 } Appeals.  
 Tuesday ..28 }  
 Wednesday 29 } App. mtns. & apps  
 Thursday ..30 } Appeals.  
 Friday ..31 } Bkt. app. & apps

Notice.—The days (if any) on which the Lords Justices shall be engaged in the Full Court, or at the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, are excepted.

## V. C. Sir RICHARD MALINS.

Lincoln's Inn.

Friday, June 19 { The First Seal.—  
 Mtns. & gen. pa.  
 Ptns. sht. caus.  
 Saturday ..20 } adj. sums, &  
 gen. paper.  
 Monday ..22 } General paper.  
 Tuesday ..23 }  
 Wednesday ..24 } The Second Seal.—  
 Mtns. & gen. pa.  
 Friday ..26 } Ptns. & gen. pa.  
 Saturday ..27 } Sht. causes adj.  
 sums, & gen. pa.  
 Monday ..29 } General paper.  
 Tuesday ..30 }  
 Wednesday July 1 }  
 Thursday ..2 } The Third Seal.—  
 Mtns. & gen. pa.  
 Friday ..3 } Sht. causes, adj.  
 sums, & gen. pa.  
 Saturday ..4 } County Ct. Apps. &  
 gen. pa.  
 Monday ..6 }  
 Tuesday ..7 } General paper.  
 Wednesday ..8 }  
 Thursday ..9 } The Fourth Seal.—  
 Mtns. & gen. pa.  
 Friday ..10 } Ptns. & gen. pa.  
 Saturday ..11 } Short causes, adj.  
 sums, & gen. pa.  
 Monday ..13 }  
 Tuesday ..14 } General paper.  
 Wednesday ..15 }  
 Thursday ..16 } The Fifth Seal.—  
 Mtns. & gen. pa.  
 Friday ..17 } Ptns. & gen. pa.  
 Saturday ..18 } Sht. causes, adj.  
 sums, & gen. pa.  
 Monday ..20 }  
 Tuesday ..21 } General paper.  
 Wednesday ..22 }  
 Thursday ..23 } The Sixth Seal.—  
 Mtns. & gen. pa.  
 Friday ..24 } Ptns. & gen. pa.  
 Saturday ..25 } Sht. causes, adj.  
 sums, & gen. pa.  
 Monday ..27 }  
 Tuesday ..28 } General paper.  
 Wednesday ..29 }  
 Thursday ..30 } The Seventh Seal.—  
 Mtns. & gen. pa.  
 Friday ..31 } Remaining motns.  
 & adj. sums.

Notice.—The Vice-Chancellor will hear Further Considerations as part of the General Paper, in priority to Original Causes, but

will not give them precedence of any Cause or matter that has already appeared in the paper.

N.B.—Any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the necessary papers left in Court with the Judge's Officer the day before the cause comes into the paper.

## V. C. Sir JAMES BACON.

Lincoln's Inn.

Friday, June 19 { The First Seal.—  
 Mtns. adj. sums, &  
 General paper.  
 Saturday ..20 } Ptns. sht. caus.  
 & gen. pa.  
 Monday ..22 } In Bankruptcy.  
 Tuesday ..23 } General paper.  
 Wednesday ..24 }  
 Thursday ..25 } The Second Seal.—  
 Mtns. adj. sums &  
 General paper.  
 Friday ..26 } General paper.  
 Saturday ..27 } Ptns. sht. caus.  
 & gen. pa.  
 Monday ..29 } In Bankruptcy.  
 Tuesday ..30 } General paper.  
 Wednesday July 1 }  
 Thursday ..2 } The Third Seal.—  
 Mtns. adj. sums, &  
 General paper.  
 Friday ..3 } General paper.  
 Saturday ..4 } Ptns. sht. caus.  
 & gen. paper.  
 Monday ..6 } In Bankruptcy.  
 Tuesday ..7 } General paper.  
 Wednesday ..8 }  
 Thursday ..9 } The Fourth Seal.—  
 Mtns. adj. sums, &  
 General paper.  
 Friday ..10 } General paper.  
 Saturday ..11 } Ptns. sht. caus.  
 & gen. pa.  
 Monday ..13 } In Bankruptcy.  
 Tuesday ..14 } General paper.  
 Wednesday ..15 }  
 Thursday ..16 } The Fifth Seal.—  
 Mtns. adj. sums, &  
 gen. paper.  
 Friday ..17 } General paper.  
 Saturday ..18 } Ptns. sht. caus.  
 & general paper.  
 Monday ..20 } In Bankruptcy.  
 Tuesday ..21 } General paper.  
 Wednesday ..22 }  
 Thursday ..23 } The Sixth Seal.—  
 Mtns. adj. sums &  
 General paper.  
 Friday ..24 } Ptns. sht. caus.  
 & gen. paper.  
 Monday ..27 } In Bankruptcy.  
 Tuesday ..28 } General paper.  
 Wednesday ..29 }  
 Thursday ..30 } The Seventh Seal.—  
 Mtns. adj. sums.  
 & gen. pa.  
 Friday ..31 } Remaining motns.  
 & adj. sums.

Notice.—The Vice-Chancellor will hear Further Considerations, as part of the General Paper, in priority to Original Causes, but will not give them precedence of any Cause or matter that has already appeared in the Paper.  
 N.B.—Any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the necessary papers left in Court with the Judge's Officer the day before the cause comes into the paper.

## V. C. Sir CHARLES HALL.

Lincoln's Inn.

Friday June 19 { The First Seal.—  
 Mtns. adj. sums.  
 & gen. pa.  
 Saturday ..20 } Ptns. sht. caus.  
 adj. sums, & gen.  
 pa.  
 Monday ..22 } General paper.  
 Tuesday ..23 }  
 Wednesday ..24 } The Second Seal.—  
 Mtns. adj. sums.  
 & gen. pa.  
 Thursday ..25 } Ptns. adj. sums.  
 & gen. pa.  
 Friday ..26 } Sht. causes, adj.  
 sums, & gen. pa.  
 Saturday ..27 }  
 Monday ..29 } General paper.  
 Tuesday ..30 }  
 Wednesday July 1 }  
 Thursday ..2 } The Third Seal.—  
 Mtns. adj. sums.  
 & gen. pa.  
 Friday ..3 } Ptns. adj. sums.  
 & gen. pa.  
 Saturday ..4 } Sht. causes, adj.  
 sums, & gen. pa.  
 Monday ..6 } General paper.  
 Tuesday ..7 }  
 Wednesday ..8 } The Fourth Seal.—  
 Mtns. adj. sums.  
 & General paper.  
 Thursday ..9 } Ptns. adj. sums.  
 & General paper.  
 Friday ..10 } Short causes, adj.  
 sums, & Gen. pa.  
 Saturday ..11 }  
 Monday ..13 }  
 Tuesday ..14 } General Paper  
 Wednesday ..15 }  
 Thursday ..16 } The Fifth Seal.—  
 Mtns. adj. sums &  
 gen. p.  
 Friday ..17 } Ptns. adj. sums.  
 & gen. pa.  
 Saturday ..18 } Short causes, adj.  
 sums, & gen. pa.  
 Monday ..20 }  
 Tuesday ..21 } General paper.  
 Wednesday ..22 }  
 Thursday ..23 } The Sixth Seal.—  
 Mtns. adj. sums.  
 & gen. pa.  
 Friday ..24 } Ptns. adj. sums.  
 & gen. pa.  
 Saturday ..25 } Sht. caus. adj.  
 ptns. & gen. pa.  
 Monday ..27 }  
 Tuesday ..28 } General paper  
 Wednesday ..29 }  
 Thursday ..30 } The Seventh Seal.—  
 Mtns. adj. sums.  
 & gen. pa.  
 Friday ..31 } Remaining motns.  
 & adj. sums.

Notice.—The Vice-Chancellor will hear Further Considerations, as part of the General Paper, in priority to Original Causes, but will not give them precedence of any Cause or Matter that has already appeared in the Paper.

N.B.—Any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the necessary papers left in Court with the Judge's Officer the day before the cause comes into the paper.

No cause, motion for decree, or further consideration, except by order of the Court, may be marked to stand over if it shall be within twelve of the last cause or matter in the printed paper of the for day hearing.

## BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

## BIRTHS.

MOSSOP.—On June 9, at Oakley Lodge, Chelsea, the wife of Mr. Charles Mossop, solicitor, of 46, Cannon-street, E.C., of a son.

JONES.—On June 3, at Beddington, Surrey, the wife of H. R. Mansel Jones, Esq., of a daughter.

PRACHEY.—On June 9, at 1, Chester-place, Regent's-park, the wife of James Pearce Prachey, Esq., of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-law, of a son.



**SWIFT**—On June 7, at Hardshaw Hall, St. Helen's, Lancashire the wife of Thomas Swift, Esq., solicitor, of a son.

#### MARRIAGE.

**MACMILLAN**—**M'CONNELL**—On June 3, at Great Missenden, Bucks, John Alex. Macmillan, barrister-at-law, Lincoln's-inn, to Helena Ruddiman, daughter of James E. M'Connell, Esq., of the Woodlands, Great Missenden, Bucks, J.P.

#### DEATHS.

**ADDISON**—On June 6, at Winckley-square, Preston, Thomas Batty Addison, Esq., recorder of that town and constable of Lancaster Castle, aged 87.

**PAGE**—On June 7, at South Hill, Basset, Henry Page, Esq., solicitor, Southampton, aged 69.

**WINSON**—On June 7, at 60, Lincoln's-inn-fields, Frederick Albert Winsor, Esq., of the Middle Temple, barrister-at-law, in his 78th year.

#### LONDON GAZETTES.

##### Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

TUESDAY, June 9, 1874.

**Brown, Walter Adam, and Charles William Waters, Solicitors, Lincoln's inn fields, Middlesex.** May 23

##### Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

TUESDAY, June 3, 1874.

###### LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

**Central Queensland Meat Preserving Company, Limited.**—Creditors are required, on or before July 3, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Samuel Lowell Price, Gresham st. Friday, July 17, at 11, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

**Drake's Patent Concrete Building Company, Limited.**—Petition for winding up, presented June 1, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall, on June 12 Webb, Queen Victoria st, solicitor for the petitioners.

**East Suffolk Tramways Company, Limited.**—By an order made by V.C. Hall, dated May 27, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above company be continued. Carr and Co, Basinghall st, solicitors for the liquidators.

**Hastings Sewage Manure Company, Limited.**—Creditors are required, on or before June 26, to send their names and addresses and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Henry Cnetteris, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st. Thursday, July 2, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

**Potent Gas Company, Limited.**—By an order made by V.C. Malins, dated May 23, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above company be continued. Heritage, Nicholas lane, solicitor for the petitioner.

**Taly-drws Slate Company, Limited.**—By an order made by V.C. Malins, dated May 22, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above company be continued; and that Mr. Henry Brown, Westminster chambers, Victoria st, the liquidator, be continued.

**Shearman, Mark lane, solicitor for the petitioner.**

FRIDAY, June 5, 1874.

###### LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

**Compagnie Generale de Deménagement, et de Transport Divers pour Paris, La France, et L'Etranger, Limited.**—Petition for winding up, presented June 3, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins, on Friday, June 26. Heritage, solicitor for the petitioners.

**Middlesex Mutual Coal Association, Limited.**—By an order made by V.C. Hall, dated May 8, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Yarde and Loder, Raymond buildings, Gray's inn, solicitors for the petitioner.

##### STANNARIES OF CORNWALL.

**Burra Burra Copper and Tin Mine Company, Limited.**—Petition for winding up, presented May 30, directed to be heard before the Vice Warden of the Stannaries, at the Law Institution, Chancery lane, on Wednesday, June 17, at 11. Affidavits intended to be used at the hearing, in opposition to the petition, must be filed at the Registrar's Office, Truro, on or before June 13, and notice thereof must at the same time be given to the petitioner, his solicitor, or his agents. Hodge and Co, Truro, agents for Downing, Redruth, solicitor for the petitioner.

**Perran Consols Mining Company.**—By an order made by the Vice Warden of the Stannaries, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Paul, Truro, solicitor for the petitioners.

##### Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, June 5, 1874.

**Andrew, John Forster, Loutham, York, Innkeeper.** July 3. Kirk v Andrew, V.C. Bacon, Buchanan, Guildenburgh.

**Benham, Daniel, Rochester, Secretary.** June 18. Benham v Bagby, V.C. Hall. Watson, Bouverie st, Fleet st.

**Chorley, George, Burnt Island, Fife, Floor Cloth Manufacturer.** July 6. Fifth v Chorley, M.R. Compton, Great George st, Westminster.

**Edwards, Frederick, Rotherham, York.** July 6. Leggoe v Edwards, V.C. Hall. Potter and Co, Rotherham.

**Merriman, Martin, Albemarle st, Esq.** July 13. Herrmann v Wheeler, V.C. Hall. Wynne and Son, Lincoln's inn fields.

**Kimber, William Maslen, Gray st, Southwark, Licensor of Victuallers.** June 30. Kimber v Dean, V.C. Malins. Crafer, Blackfriars rd.

**Nowell, George Henry, Liverpool, Pilot.** July 1. Nowell v Dickinson, M.R. Harris, Liverpool.

**Oxley, James William, Heathfield, Sussex, Farmer.** July 3. Barrow v Burgess, V.C. Hall. Fry, Bedford row, Holborn.

##### Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

TUESDAY, June 2, 1874.

**Amber, Ann Rowland, Western villas, Blenheim rd, Paddington** June 20. Amber, Watling st.

**Barley, James, Scumthorpe, Lincoln, Gent.** Aug 1. Goy and Cross Burton-on-Humber.

**Bird, Frederic, Grosvenor st, Doctor.** July 20. Barnard and Co, Lancaster place, Strand.

**Clark, James, Lambourn, Essex, Farmer.** June 30. Ingle and Co, Thrusfield st.

**Coleman, John, Kingston, Cambridge, Farmer.** Aug 1. Vossy, Baidock, Herts.

**Colnett, William, St Mary Abbot's terrace, Kensington, Gent.** July 27. Fuller and Saltwell, Regent st.

**Doncaster, Painter, Exeter, Gent.** June 22. Edgcombe and Cole, Porsea.

**Doll, William, Castle st, Long acro, Brewer.** July 15. Parrott, Aylesbury.

**Down, Edward, Hertford, Retired Col.** July 23. M'Millin, Bloomsbury square.

**Fynmore, Elizabeth, Upper Porchester st, Cambridge square, Lodging House Keeper.** July 16. Whites and Co, Badgo row, Cannon st.

**Green, Cornwell, Sherborne st, Dowham rd, Islington.** July 1. Dawbarn and Wise, March.

**Hamilton, Francis Seymour, Trient, South Tyrol, Austria, Col.** July 1. Guscombe and Co, Essex st, Strand.

**Laurence, Frances, Addison rd, Kensington.** July 1. Walker and Co, St Swin's lane.

**Mather, William, St Albans, Herts, Gent.** July 8. Davies and Co, Warwick st, Regent st.

**Morley, Benjamin, Percy Lodge, Kensington, Gent.** Aug 1. Wells and Hind, Nottingham.

**Reid, Eliza, Warrington, Lancashire.** Aug 1. Ridgway, Warrington.

**Sherry, Martha Williams, Welling, Somerset.** July 1. Ransom, Wellington.

**Stallard-Penoyre, Anna Maria Brodbelt Napleton, Clifford, Hereford.** Aug 1. Sladen and Mackenzie, Delahay st, Westminster.

**Thomas, George, Gravesend, Kent, Steam Tug Boat Owner.** July 21. Bewley, Gravesend.

**Tooley, George, Horncastle, Lincoln, Gent.** June 30. Selby.

**Whipham, Annie, St John's hill, Battersea.** July 13. Hagues, Devereux court, Temple.

**Womack, Joseph, Barnsley, York, Hair Dresser.** July 1. Newman and Sons, Barnsley.

**Yates, Ellen, Stoke-upon-Trent, Stafford.** July 11. Hand and Co, Stafford.

FRIDAY, June 5, 1874.

**Charlton, Edward, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Esq.** August 1. Leadbitte and Harvey, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

**Day, Edmund, Norton, York, Clerk in Holy Orders.** August 3. Simpson, Malton.

**Gill, Eleanor Smith, Salford, Lancashire.** August 1. Barr and Co, Leeds.

**Hall, Joseph, Harrogate, Land Surveyor.** Sept 1. Kirby and Son, Knaresborough.

**Hare, Robert, Wyndham st, Bryanston square, Esq.** July 10. Seading, Gordon st.

**Haywood, William, Waddington, Lincoln, Farmer.** Aug 1. Toyneeb and Larkin, Lincoln.

**Keel, John, Hemphett, Somerset, Farmer.** July 1. Mogr, Bristol.

**Kitto, Captain William, Redruth, Cornwall, Mine Agent.** July 14. Hodge and Co, Truro.

**Mitchell, Samuel, Aldborough Hatch, Essex, Farmer.** July 1. Clifton and Haynes, Romford.

**Pocock, Marianne Sophia, Calais, France.** July 1. Jenkyn, Lincoln's-inn fields.

**Sidney, Christians, Cowpen Hall, Northumberland.** August 1. Lead-bitter and Harvey, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

**Smith, Joseph, Shelsley Walsh, Worcester, Gent.** July 24. Church and Co, Bedford row.

**Stewart, Mary Ann, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Shopkeeper.** July 13. Eldon, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

**Streeter, Thomas, Romsey, Southamton, Timber Merchant.** Sept 29. Stead and Co, Rousey.

**Thrower, John Lewis, Norwich, Gent.** July 15. Davenoy, Norwich.

**Tickler, Robert, Wainfleet All St, Lincoln, Gent.** June 22. Bassitt, Wainfleet.

**Truman, Joseph, Hockley st, Homerton, Laundryman.** July 1. Bohm, New inn, Strand.

**Vincent, Cyril, Oxford, Gent.** July 11. Clarke and Co, Gresham House, Old Broad st.

**Warner, Richard, Bulkington, Warwick, Farmer.** July 18. Wood, Nuneaton.

##### Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, June 5, 1874.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar

To Surrender in London.

**Pool, John, otherwise Rivers, Manor's terrace, Brayard's rd, Peckham, Vocalist.** Pet June 2. Hazlit, Gent. June 23 at 11.

**Walsh, Joseph, Belair rd, Finchley rd, Gent.** Pet June 1. Broughton, June 19 at 11.

To Surrender in the Country.

**Brown, James, Ashurst, Kent, Builder.** Pet June 1. Cripps. Tanbridge Wells, June 15 at 3.

**Gordon, John, Liverpool, Cotton Dealer.** Pet June 2. Watson. Liverpool, June 17 at 2.

**Grange, Edward, Lancashire, Brewer.** Pet June 1. Tweedale. Oldham, June 17 at 13.

**Hobroyd, Daniel, and William Henry Bottomley, Bradford, York, Cotton Warp Merchants.** Pet June 3. Bottomley. Bradford, June 16 at 9.

**Jessop, Simeon, and John Jessop, Brighouse, York, Carriers.** Pet June 1. Alexander. Halifax, June 13 at 11.

Kingston, Henry James, South st, Greenwich, Smelter of Metals. Pet June 3. Pitt-Taylor, Greenwich, June 23 at 2  
Mauder, John, Crediton, Devon, Watchmaker. Pet June 1. Daw. Exeter, June 18 at 11  
Rieveley, Thomas Warren, York, Flour Merchant. Pet June 3. Ferkins. York, June 17 at 11  
Shearn, Mark, Bristol, Boot Maker. Pet June 4. Harley. Bristol. June 16 at 12

THURSDAY, June 9, 1874.

To Surrender in London.

Fahrenbach, Albert, Honey lane Market, Merchant. Pet June 4. Pepps. June 25 at 11  
Meyrick, William, Chestow place, Bayswater, Gent. Pet June 5. Roche. June 23 at 11.30  
Robinson, Robert, Newington green. Pet June 5. Roche. June 25 at 12  
Siewers, Otto, Wormwood st, Merchant. Pet June 6. Pepps. June 30 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Foster, Tom George, William Clayton, and John Robert Foster, Manchester, Parasol Manufacturers. Pet June 6. Kay. Manchester. June 25 at 9.30

Gambis, Edward, Sheffield, General Merchant. Pet June 1. Wake. Sheffield, June 25 at 12

Jeffrey, John, Barford St Michael, Oxford, Carrier. Pet June 4. Fortescue. Banbury, June 20 at 10

Steele, William Henry, Bradford, York, Boot Dealer. Pet June 5. Robinson. Bradford, June 23 at 10

#### BANKRUPTCY ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, June 5, 1874.

Wray, William George, Kirkham, Lancashire, Innkeeper. June 2

THURSDAY, June 9, 1874.

Clarke, Charles Leigh, Manchester, Iron Merchant. June 4

Collins, Thomas Wedge, Birmingham, Jeweller. June 1

Lennie, James Campbell, Liverpool, Jeweller. June 5

#### Liquidation by Arrangement.

#### FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, June 5, 1874.

Akkrill, John, Wellingborough, Northampton, Builder. June 22 at 11 at the Hind Hotel, Wellingborough. Parker, Wellingborough. Adlington, Robert, Mortimer rd, Kingland, Corn Chandler. June 22 at 2 at offices of Blachford and Riches, Great Swan alley, Moorgate at Andrews, John, Sneathwick, Stafford, Beerseller. June 23 at 3 at the Waggon and Horses Hotel, Oldbury

Balcock, Stephen John, Lancaster rd, East Barnet, Music Seller. June 16 at 11 at 35, Walbrook. Price, Chesapeake

Barnes, William, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Grocer. June 17 at 10 at offices of Smith, Grosvenor place, Cheltenham

Barron, Robert, Linker, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancashire, Draper. June 19 at 11 at the Ship Hotel, Strand, Barrow-in-Furness. Bradshaw, Barrow-in-Furness

Bevan, Alexander, High st, Stratford, Paper Bag Maker. June 12 at 11 at the Two Brewers, High st, Stratford. Padmore, Half Moon crescent, Islington

Boyce, George, Warning Camp, Sussex, General Dealer. June 24 at 11 at offices of Goodman, Prince Albert st, Brighton

Branscom, Frederic, Great Grimsby, Lincoln, Boot Maker. June 17 at 1 at the George Hotel, Whitefriargate, Kingston-upon-Hull. Mason, Great Grimsby

Brooks, Samuel, Coombs st, City rd, Law Clerk. June 18 at 3 at the Weavers' Hall, Basinghall st. Brown

Brown, William, Scarborough, York, Grocer. June 19 at 3 at offices of Hick, Elders st, Scarborough

Buckley, John, and Abraham Buckley, Mirfield, York, Carpet Manufacturers. June 19 at 11 at offices of Chadwick and Sons, Church st, Dewsbury

Carter, John, Eiland, York, Manufacturer. June 17 at 2.30 at offices of Leeming, George st, Halifax

Chapman, Thomas Wood, and Edward Chapman, Egremont, Cumberland, Hemp and Tow Spinners. June 19 at 3 at the County Hotel, Lancashire. Postlethwaite, Jnn, Whitehaven

Collins, Neri, Llandport, Hants, Coal Dealer. June 17 at 3 at offices of Wainscot, Union st, Portsea. Blake, Portsea

Collis, Samuel Grey, Heigham, Norwich, Cabinet Maker. June 18 at 12 at the County Court, Redwell st, Norwich

Death, Michael, Edgware rd, Cab Proprietor. June 12 at 4 at offices of Yorke, Marylebone rd

Deporter, John Baptist James, Union court, Old Broad st, Merchant. June 23 at 11 at 4, Union court, Old Broad st. Marsden

Deathwaite, Robert, Ripon, Grocer. June 18 at 10 at the White Horse Inn, North st, Ripon

Ellison, Charles, Standley Garner Whiting, and John Murphy, Liverpool, Timber Merchants. June 17 at 3 at offices of Harwood and Co, North John st, Liverpool

Evans, Ann, Britonferry, Glamorgan, Grocer. June 23 at 12 at offices of Charles, Parade, Neath

Firth, William, Manchester, Manufacturer of Oil Cloths. June 18 at 2.30 at offices of Phillips, Brown st, Manchester

Frank, Julius, Liverpool, Jeweller. June 23 at 2 at offices of Etty, Lord st, Liverpool

Gardiner, Thomas, Marlborough rd, Chelsea, Plumber. June 16 at 2 at offices of Stophar, Coleman st

Gibbs, John Alfred, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Ironfounder. June 25 at 2 at offices of Chesbire, Regent st, Cheltenham

Goodhand, Thomas, Gomersal, York, Licensed Victualler. June 22 at 11 at offices of Rooke and Midgley, Boar lane, Leeds

Grand, John, Princes terrace, Waltham green, Bootmaker. June 15 at 2 at offices of Gowing's, Coleman st

Gregory, William Henry, Bristol, Draper. June 16 at 12 at offices of Honey and Co, King st, Chesapeake. Harwood, Bristol

Griffiths, Stephen, Tredegar, Monmouth, Grocer. June 20 at 12 at offices of Hancock and Co, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol. James, Merthyr Tydfil

Hampson, Charles, Norton, York, Boot Dealer. June 20 at 11 at offices of Mirfin, Park row, Leeds. Hardwick, Leeds

Harrison, James, Acle, Norfolk, Farmer. June 19 at 12 at offices of Wiltshire, Hall plain, Great Yarmouth

Heywood, William, and Lees Heywood, Oldham, Lancashire, General Dealers. June 18 at 11 at the Mitre Hotel, Manchester, Clerk, Oldham

Hollyman, William, Roath, near Cardiff, Glamorgan, Grocer. June 1 at 1 at 18, High st, Cardiff. Morgan

Howarth, William, Heap, Lancashire, Woollen Manufacturer. June 23 at 3 at offices of Grundy and Co, Bury

Howies, Richard, Birmingham, Tailor. June 16 at 11 at offices of Beaton Victoria buildings, Temple row, Birmingham

Ingram, William, Crawford st, Marylebone rd, Butcher. June 15 at 4 at offices of Yorke, Marylebone rd

Jung, Peter, Newman passage, Newman st, Oxford st, Chairmaker. June 15 at 2 at offices of Moore, Chancery lane

King, Thomas Martin, Ipswich, Suffolk, Commercial Traveller. June 29 at 3 at offices of Hill, St Nicholas st, Ipswich

Lewis, Francis, and James Brindley, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Gas Fittings Manufacturers. June 19 at 2 at the Talbot Hotel, King st, Wolverhampton. Cresswell, Willenthall

Lewthwaite, Edwin, Halifax, York, out of business. June 25 at 11 at offices of Norris and Co, Halifax

Lovett, Samuel, Chester, Grocer. June 19 at 2 at offices of Evans and Lockett, Commerce chambers, Lord st, Liverpool

Lowndes, James William, Bilenhead, Chester, Drysalter. June 16 at 2 at offices of Dowham, Market st, Bilenhead

Mallinson, Joseph, Bradford, York, Pianoforte and Music Seller. June 18 at 3 at offices of Moore, Old Market, Market st, Bradford

Morris, Anne Jane, Folkestone, Kent, Boarding house Proprietor. June 17 at 2 at the King's Arms Hotel, Folkestone. Minter, Folkestone

Murray, Edward John, and David Moore, Middlesborough, York, Grocers. June 15 at 3 at offices of Draper, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees

Norris, John, Kineston-upon-Hull, Ale Merchant. June 12 at 3 at offices of Chambers, Scale lane, Kingston-upon-Hull

Oakden, Joseph, Grumman rd, Peckham, Clerk in Holy Orders. June 19 at 3 at offices of Lowe, Bell yard, Doctors' commons

Oppenheim, Ernest, and Udo Schrader, Mark lane, Merchants. June 23 at 2 at the City Terminus Hotel, South Eastern Railway Station, Cannon st. Hollams and Co, Mincing lane

Phillips, Julia, Penton place, Kennington Park rd. June 18 at 2 at offices of Palmer, Gracechurch st

Phillips, Samuel, Ely place, Commission Agent. June 30 at 4 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st. Lumley and Lumley, Old Jewry chambers

Pink, Joseph, Chipping Norton, Oxford, General Dealer. June 18 at 11 at the White Hart Hotel, High st, Chipping Norton. Saunders, Chipping Norton

Preece, Daniel, Birmingham, Boot Maker. June 19 at 1 at offices of Duke, Christ Church passage, Birmingham

Rees, Arthur, Coalfaworth, Wigan, Gent. June 25 at 12 at the King's Arms Hotel, Barnstaple, Huggins, Exeter

Rowlands, Thomas, Salford, Lancashire, Provision Dealer's Assistant. June 18 at 3 at offices of Ambie, Bloom st, Manchester

Rosse, Henry, Alverstoke, Hants, Messman. June 23 at 3 at Selborne House, Kent rd, Southsea. Martin, Jun

Sanchez, Raphael, Crutched Friars, Merchant. June 19 at 3 at offices of Raven and Curtis, Queen Victoria st

Searle, John, Margate, Kent, Commercial Clerk. June 8 at 3 at offices of Sankey and Co, Cecil square, Margate

Seear, William Henry, Hare st, Woolwich, Grocer. June 18 at 2 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue, Basinghall st. Raven and Curtis, Queen Victoria st

Sherwood, John William, Sherborne, Dorset, Innkeeper. June 10 at the Digby Hotel, Sherborne, in lieu of the place originally named

Simmons, Thomas, Portland rd, South Norwood, Ironmonger. June 18 at 11 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Chorley and Crawford

Moorgate at Slater, Houghton, and William Slater, Yeaton, York, Cloth Manufacturers. June 17 at 3 at offices of Fawcett and Malcolm, Park row, Leeds

Satcliffe, Joseph, Thomas Sutcliffe, and Benjamin Sutcliffe, Grimsby, near Huddersfield, Common Brewers. June 17 at 3 at offices of Drake, John William st, Huddersfield

Tait, Jessie, Morpeth, Northumberland, Ironmonger. June 17 at 1 at offices of Wicksdon, Pilgrim st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Dickinson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Thomson, James, Great College st, Camden Town, Builder. June 30, at 3 at 67, Russell square. May

Thomson, John George, Whitefriars st, Fleet st, East India Agent Aug 12 at 12 at offices of Oehme, Gresham House, Old Broad st

Topham, Joseph, Jnn, Wyboston, Bedford, Farmer. June 18 at 4.30 at the Corn Exchange, St Neots. Simson, Bedford

Turner, Edwin, Sheffield, Saw Manufacturer. June 18 at 12 at offices of Rogers and Co, Bank st, Sheffield

Ward, Isaac James, Chalcut terrace, Regent's Park rd, Carver. June 15 at 10 at offices of Gosly, Westminster Bridge rd, Lambeth

Watson, William, Penrith, Cumberland, Plumber. June 17 at 11 at offices of Arison, Penrith

Whitehead, Frederick Matthias, John William Whitehead, and David Henry Whitehead, Great Portland st, Sanitary Engineers, June 18 at 3 at offices of Tonge, Great Portland st, Oxford

Whitworth, John Henry, Stafford, Walsall, Licensed Victualler. June 23 at 11 at offices of Crump, Bridge st, Walsall

Williams, John, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Stationer. June 18 at 11 at 16, High st, Cardiff. Morgan

Wilson Francis, Birmingham, Clothier. June 17 at 11 at offices of Free Temple row, Birmingham

TUESDAY, June 9, 1874.

Abley, John, Knighton, Radnor, Cabinet Maker. June 23 at 1 at the Crown Inn, Broad st, Knighton. Craig, Shrewsbury

Allan, Andrew, Middlesborough, York, Grocer. June 26 at 12 at Barker's Temperance Hotel, Bridge st West, Middlesborough. Bainbridge, Middlesborough

Allen, Edward, Bradford, York, Stuff Manufacturer. June 19 at 11 at offices of Wood and Killick, Commercial Bank buildings, Bradford

Artis, John Howell, Attleborough, Norfolk, Baker. June 24 at 11 at offices of Hower and Francis, St Giles st, Norwich

Atty, Edward, Arling, Market rd, West Dulwich, out of business. June 18 at 2 at offices of Barton and Drew, Fero at

Axon, Hannah, Manchester, Painter. June 24 at 3 at offices of Barton, King st, Manchester

Baldwin, James William, Upper st, Islington, House Decorator. June 23 at 3.30 at offices of Dubois, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st

Barlow, Edmund, Warrington, Lancashire, Joiner. June 19 at 3 at offices of Br-therton, Bank st, Warrington

Barnham, John James, Oak rd, New Wandsworth, Cab Driver. June 20 at 3 at the Alma Tavern, York rd, Wandsworth. Marshall

Bate, Diercy Jasper, Lezant, near Lancaster, Cornwall, Miller. June 22 at 11 at offices of Elworthy and Co, Courtenay st, Plymouth

Bell, Stephen, n, Osmotherley, York, Farmer. June 23 at 11 at offices of James, Northallerton

Bennett, Frederick John, and Frederick Godley, King's Cross, Coal Merchants. June 20 at 12 at the Guildhall Tavern, East and Funtston

Borham, Reuben, Chertsey, Surrey, Pork Butcher. June 23 at 3 at the Crown Hotel London st, Chertsey. Jenkins, Tavistock st, Strand

Bridger, John, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, Builder. June 17 at 10 at the Camden Hotel, Tunbridge Wells. Palmer, Tunbridge

Brook, Samuel, Idle, York, Cloth Manufacturer. June 23 at 11 at offices of Watson and Dickson, Victoria chambers, Bank st, Bradford

Brooke, George, Fomhill rd, Islington, Trimming Manufacturer. June 13 at 1 at offices of Knight, Newgate st

Brooks, William, Swanborne, Bucks, Publican. June 20 at 11 at the Swan and Castle Hotel, Buckingham. Kirby and Son, Banbury

Butler, George, St Helen's, Lancashire, Clothier. June 22 at 11 at offices of Henly and Kenyon, Newmarket place, St Helen's

Chanter, Thomas Henry, Bristol, Hawker. June 20 at 11 at offices of Beckingham, Albion chambers, Broad st, Bristol

Clark, George James, London, Staffrd, General Dealer. June 18 at 11 at offices of Welch, Caroline st, London

Cloagh, Thomas, Dawson, and William Gallon, Whitehaven, Coach Builders. June 23 at 12 at offices of Atter, New Lowther st, Whitehaven

Cole, John, Ashton, Birmingham, Pork Butcher. June 19 at 10.15 at offices of East, Colmore row, Birmingham

Curtis, John, Birmingham, Pocket Book Manufacturer. June 18 at 3 at offices of Pitt, Bennett's hill, Birmingham

Crane, Edward, Old Castle st, Whitechapel, Mantle Maker. June 25 at 3 at offices of Lindus, Cheapside

Cross, Frederick John, High st, Clapham, Upholsterer. June 25 at 2 at 6, Beaufort buildings, Strent, Lond

Dick, Thomas, Paisneroff, Lancashire, Plasterer. June 25 at 3 at offices of Sampson, South King st, Manchester

Dawson, Duncan, Kingston-upon-Hull, Carrier. June 22 at 1 at 8, Parliament st, Kingston-upon-Hull. Walker and Spink

Dixie, Richard William, Guildford, Surrey. June 24 at 2 at the Rainbow Tavern, Fleet st. Vosper, Havant

Dobry, Caroline, Home terrace, Hammersmith, Boot Maker. June 22 at 3 at 2, Pon's Bakehouse court, Doctors' commons. Child

Eastwood, John, Bradford, York, Machine Wool Comber. June 30 at 14 at the N.W. Inn, Tyrral st, Bradford. Harris, Bradford

Fink, Clara, Hammer's square, Whitechapel, Licensed Victualler. June 30 at 3 at offices of Stann and Co, King's rd, Bedford row

Fordham, Henry William, Tabernacle w/d, Finsbury, Cabinet Maker. June 26 at 2 at offices of Tras, Lincoln's inn fields

Fox, William, Southend, Essex, Greener. June 22 at 12 at 35, Lincoln's inn fields. Wood and Son, Rochford

Foxton, William, Bradford, York, Shoemaker. June 29 at 2 at offices of Harle, Chapel lane, Bradford

Gill, Joseph Clayton, Handforth, Cheshire, Licensed Victualler. June 25 at 3 at offices of Brown, Market place, Stockport

Gillard, William, St. Sherborne, Dorset, Commercial Traveller. June 25 at 3 at offices of Davies, Abbey, Sherborne

Grinshaw, John, Oxchide, Lancashire, Woollen Manufacturer. June 22 at 4 at the Lyceum, Bailie st, Rochdale. Standing, Rochdale

Hart, Arthur, Blinton, Stafford, Commission Agent. June 25 at 3 at offices of Hoare, Mount pleasant, Blinton

Hart, Henry, Brighton, Sussex, Boot Maker. June 10 at 12 at offices of Smith and Co, Broad st, Chapsal e. Lamb, Brighton

Harrison, George, Be rr, Skirrekat, Halifax, York, Builder. June 17 at 4 at offices of Storey, Cheap-side, Halifax

Henke, Cord, Hugh Holborn, Tailor. June 22 at 2 at offices of Swains, Cheapside

Hewitt, James, Bristol, out of business. June 23 at 12 at offices of Hanson, and Co, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol. Benson and Thomas, Bristol

Higgin, John, Ince-within-Mackerfield, Lancashire, Innkeeper. June 25 at 11 at offices of Wright and Appleton, King st, Wigan

Hinton, Matthew, Loughton, Stafford, out of business. June 16 at 4 at the Vic Inn Stafford. Shires, Leicester

Hirsch, Eugene, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Merchant. June 22 at 11 at offices of Farr and Co, Asenside hill, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Horne, John, Gange, Weston-super-Mare, Sum-rost, Plasterer. June 25 at 11 at offices of Smith, Handel House, High st, Weston-super-Mare

Humbly, William, W. d'winton, Wilts, Blacksmith. June 24 at 3 at offices of Bodin, Salisbury

Humphreys, John, Llan abeth, Anglesey, Pig Dealer. June 30 at 2 at the Roe and Crown, Stanley st, Holyhead. Barrer and Son, Holyhead

Jackson, William, M-leven, Worcester, Horticultural Agent. June 20 at 11 at offices of Wall, Stourbridge

Jones, David, Aberbach, Carnarvon, Greener. June 20 at 1 at 6, Market st, Carnarvon. Picton and Co, Pwllheli

Just, John, Gange, Lancashire, Coal Merchant. June 26 at 4 at offices of Hinde and Co, Mount st, Albert square, Manchester

Juss, Robert, B-leen, Manchester, Cotton Waste Dealer. June 26 at 3 at offices of Hinde and Co, Mount st, Albert square, Manchester

Levin, John, Sunderland, Durham, Upholsterer. June 23 at 1 at offices of Sherwood and Company, John st, Sunderland. Tilley, Sunderland

Lindsay, Humphrey, John Winterbottom, and William Henry Winterbottom, Dutton, Lancashire, Sewing Machine Makers. June 23 at 3 at offices of Vaughan and Co, Princess st, Manchester

Loane, Peter, Birmingham, Plumber. June 19 at 11 at offices of East, Colmore row, Birmingham

Lor, John, W-enecrode, Llandudarn, Cardigan, Carrier. June 19 at 12 at the T. lla Inn, North rd, Aberavon. Jones, Aberystwith

Love, Charles, Aberystwith, Monmouth, Builder. June 25 at 2 at offices of Jones, F. o'more st, Aberystwith

Lowndes, James, Birmingham, Boot Maker. June 20 at 10 at offices of Joynt, Moor st, Birmingham

Mills, Edwin, Longton, Stafford, out of business. June 16 at 12 at the Queen's Hotel, Hanley. Shires, Leicester

Morgan, Thomas, Weston-super-Mare, Somerset, Leather Seller. June 25 at 12 at the Railway Hotel, Regent st, Weston-super-Mare. Jones, Weston-super-Mare

Morgan, William, Straker, Blaenavon, Monmouth, Ironmonger. June 16 at 3 at offices of Lloyd, Park terrace, Pontypool

Neech, John, Hackbridge Railway Station, Surrey, Coal Merchant. June 19 at 12 at offices of Pullen, Gresham buildings, Guildhall

Parton, Thomas, Etruria, Stafford, Cardigan. June 16 at 10 at 26, Cheap-side, Hanley. Shires, Leicester

Pierpoint, Polliott, Rabbicombe, St Mary Church, Devon, University Tutor. June 27 at 12 at offices of Carter and Son, Carey buildings, Abbey rd, Torquay

Plant, Thomas, Neath, Earthenware Dealer. June 24 at 12 at offices of Cuthbertson and Turberville, Water st, Neath

Preston, Henry, Plymouth, Devon, Hair Dresser. June 22 at 11 at offices of Convey and Almond, George st, Plymouth

Raynor, George, Ash grove, Hackney, Shoe Manufacturer. June 23 at 2 at offices of Chalk, Moorgate st

Rees, Edward William, Waen Elin, Llansantffraid, Cardigan, Innkeeper. June 20 at 12 at offices of Jones, Pier st, Aberystwith

Reid, James, Saint Helena, Isle of Wight, Land Steward. June 22 at 3 at 69, George st, Ryde. Urry

Richards, John, Rala, Merioneth, Market Gardener. June 25 at 12 at the Royal Oak Inn, Corwen. James Corwen

Ronte, Augustus, Little Essex st, Kingland rd, Cabinet Maker. June 23 at 2 at offices of Nust, Brabant court, Philipot lane

Schiff, Abraham, Gracechurch st, Cigar Merchant. June 22 at 12 at offices of Wild and Co, Ironmonger lane, Cheapside

Shackleton, Walter, Mare st, Hackney, Upholsterer. June 22 at 12 at 145, Cheapside. Kynaston and Casquet, Queen st, Cheapside

Shaw, Edmund, Leeds, Cut Nail Manufacturer. June 18 at 3 at offices of Mirfin, Park row, Leeds. Pullan

Short, William James, Taunton, Somerset, late Innkeeper. June 23 at 11 at offices of Reeves, Mary st, Taunton

Smith, George, Sparbrook, Worcester, Warehouseman. June 19 at 3 at offices of Walter, Waterloo st, Birmingham

Smith, William, Tarrington, Hereford, Farmer. June 22 at 1 at the Star Hotel, Worcester. Piper, Ledbury

Swift, Joseph, Blackburn, Lancashire, Draper. June 23 at 11 at offices of Radcliffe, Clayton st, Blackburn

Tealby, George Henry, Birmingham, Hosier. June 19 at 2 at offices of Morgan, Waterloo st, Birmingham

Thorogood, Richard, Prisoner, Springfield. June 23 at 3 at the Red Lion Ho el Billericay. Woodward, Ingram court, Fenchurch st

Tilly, William Smith, and John Tilly, Gateshead, Durham, Grocers. June 19 at 11 at offices of Hoyle and Co, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Tilt, Joseph William, Park place, Park rd, Clapham, Cowkeeper. July 2 at 2 at offices of Cooper, Portman st, Portman square

Tingam, James, Southport, Lancashire, Theatrical Manager. June 19 at 3 at offices of Green, Clayton square, Liverpool

Topham, Joseph, sen, Dnloe, Bedford Farmer. June 25 at 4 at offices Day and Wade-Gery, St Neots. Conquest

Wainwright, John Hanley, Stafford, Fruit and Potato Salesman. June 24 at 11 at offices of Litchfield, Bagnal st, Newcastle-under-Lyme

Webb, John, Leicester, out of business. June 15 at 2 at offices of Fowler and Co, Friar lane, Leicester

West, Robert, Beverley, York, Stationer. June 23 at 2 at offices of Hornley, Staple inn, Holborn. Walker and Spink

Wincott, John, West Bromwich, Stafford, Beer-seller. June 22 at 11 at offices of Topham, High st, West Bromwich

Wolf, Edward, Fore st, Merchant. June 23 at 11 at 33, Gutter lane. Levinton, Bishopsgate st Within

**FUNERAL REFORM.**—The exorbitant items of the Undertaker's bill have long operated as an oppressive tax upon all classes of the community. With a view of applying a remedy to this serious evil the LONDON NECROPOLIS COMPANY, when opening their extensive cemetery at Woking, held themselves prepared to undertake the whole duties relating to interments at fixed and moderate scales of charge, from which survivors may choose according to their means and the requirements of the case. The Company also undertakes the conduct of Funerals to other cemeteries, and to all parts of the United Kingdom. A pamphlet containing full particulars may be obtained, or will be forwarded, upon application to the Chief Office, 4 Lancaster-place, Strand, W.C.

**EDE AND SON,**  
**ROBE AND MAKERS.**  
By Special Appointment to HER MAJESTY, THE LORD CHANCELLOR, the Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.  
SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.  
BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSELS' DITTO.  
CORPORATION ROBES.  
UNIVERSITY AND CLERGY GOWNS, &c.  
ESTABLISHED 1659.  
94, CHANCERY-LANE, LONDON.

**CARR'S, 265, STRAND.**—Dinners (from the joint) vegetables, &c., 1s. 6d., or with Soup or Fish, 2s. and 2s. 6d. "If I desire a substantial dinner off the joint, with the agreeable accompaniment of light wine, both cheap and good, I know only of one house, and that is in the Strand, close to Danes Inn. There you may wash down the roast beef of old England with excellent Burgundy, at two shillings a bottle, or you may be supplied with half a bottle for a shilling."—All the Year Round, June, 18, 1864, 440 page.  
The new Hall lately added is one of the handsomest dining-rooms in London. Dinners (from the joint), vegetables, &c., 1s. 6d.



